

- Edited Transcript -

The Historical Split Between Charity and Philanthropy

Tuesday, November 4, 2014 ▪ 12:00 to 1:30 p.m.

Hudson Institute ▪ Betsy and Walter Stern Conference Center ▪ 1015 15th Street, NW ▪
Suite 600

Event Description

As many of you know, we are about to close the doors on the Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civil Society, after 12 years of operation and 148 panel discussions on all aspects of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector, approaching them from a rich variety of disciplines and points of view. Nothing could be more appropriate for our final panel than to turn our attention to the proudest claim of the modern American foundation: namely, that it practices philanthropy – it solves problems at their source – as opposed to charity, which merely puts band-aids on problems.

We commissioned the first thoroughgoing historical monograph on this topic from Benjamin Soskis, a Fellow at George Mason’s Center for Nonprofit Management, Philanthropy and Policy. To discuss this major addition to the scholarship on philanthropy and civil society, we assembled a distinguished panel, including Case Western Reserve Professor David Hammack, Patty Stonesifer, formerly of the Gates Foundation, and Scott Walter of the Capital Research Center. Hudson Institute Senior Fellow William Schambra moderated this event.

PROGRAM AND PANEL

12:00 p.m.	Welcome by Hudson Institute’s William Schambra
12:10	Panel discussion David C. Hammack , Hiram C. Haydn Professor of History at Case Western Reserve University Benjamin Soskis , Fellow at the Center for Nonprofit Management, Philanthropy, and Policy at George Mason University Patty Stonesifer , President and Chief Executive of Martha’s Table Scott Walter , Executive Vice President of the Capital Research Center
1:10	Question-and-answer session
1:30	Adjournment

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: Good afternoon, I'm Bill Schambra, Director of the Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civil Renewal. Kristen McIntyre and I welcome you to today's panel discussion entitled, "[The Historical Split Between Charity and Philanthropy](#)."

As most of you know by now, this will be the final panel of some 148 that the Center has sponsored over the last ten years. The transcripts and videos for most of them should be around on the Hudson website forever, or at least until we get a new IT consultant and they all disappear.

Before we get to our topic today, it is an honor to say a few words of thanks to our sponsors and supporters over the years. First, our thanks to the Hudson Institute for putting up with what must have seemed a bizarre and idiosyncratic focus for a public policy center. And given the way we approached philanthropy, that is, frequently from a somewhat skeptical perspective, it must have occurred to Hudson more than once that poking funders at the same time that we are seeking their support probably wasn't an optimal fundraising strategy.

Next, our thanks to our primary funder, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation in Milwaukee, Dan Schmidt and Mike Hartmann are here in front from the Foundation to make sure I don't walk out of the office with the furniture that they have paid for. One could not have asked for a better chief backer. I was never, not one single time, asked to do a panel or asked not to do a panel on any topic, no matter how controversial.

We did in fact over the years hold panels on some topics that other leaders in the world of philanthropy assured me were better left unheld. In all their relations with us, the Bradley staff modeled the principles of good grant-making that most other foundations honor in the breach, general operating support, minimal reporting and minimal metrics, and in general, the trust that we knew what we were doing.

The latitude that we were afforded by Bradley is reflected in some significant grants we attracted from other foundations of a distinctly different political inclination, namely the Hewlett Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropies, to whom we are also grateful.

The odd bed-fellows mix of funders underlined the Center's determination to bring the same broad mix to our topics and panelists. To the best of our abilities, we sought genuine balance and yet, a civil exchange among diverse political points of view, interests, and disciplines.

This quality is becoming ever more rare in public policy generally, I think you would agree with me, and it was never much present in the world of philanthropy to begin with, so I do hope someone picks up this torch.

Our thanks today is also owed to the panelists who helped us to achieve that mix over the years, some of whom are in the room today. Scott and David on our panel today have been on other panels. Stacey Palmer is here from the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, who has been on panels and co-sponsored a number of them.

Ruth McCambridge of the *Nonprofit Quarterly*, was also a panelist many times and a co-sponsor. Rick Cohen, when he was both director of NCRP and in his current status at *NPQ*, Sue Hoechstetter at the Alliance for Justice. Ray Madoff, who has come down from Boston College Law School just for this occasion, so I am grateful to her, she has been on two or three of our panels. Bob Woodson, you have been on panels before, and I know Carol Adelman has as well. I'm sure I have forgotten some folks or overlooked someone, but we would like to express our gratitude to all the panelists who have participated over the years.

Finally, we owe immense gratitude to, and I think a round of applause, for the two people who did all the heavy lifting for the Center while I posed as the Director, namely Kristen McIntyre, currently Assistant Director, and Krista Rogers, her predecessor here at the Bradley Center. As I said, they are the ones who did all the work and we certainly owe them, I think, a round of applause. [APPLAUSE]

Now under the topic for the day, and I apologize to our discussants for this lengthy valediction, the notion that philanthropy is somehow different from and better than mere charity is, as the essay before us today points out, perhaps the central orthodoxy of the modern American foundation. The urge to do more than put Band-Aids on problems, but somehow to resolve them at their source, was the founding aspiration of the first great foundations of the twentieth century and still today fires the imagination of so many wealthy newcomers to philanthropy.

It has certainly spawned our favorite clichés in the sector, ranging from piscatorial, teaching a man to fish rather than giving him one, to the neonatal, not being satisfied with snatching babies from the river but sending someone upstream to figure out who is putting them there in the first place. That latter cliché about going up-river overlooks the distinct possibility that the person dispatched up-river will get hopelessly lost in the riparian undergrowth and won't be available to do either charity or philanthropy.

At any rather, there can be no appropriate way for the Bradley Center to exit than to turn our attention to this central distinction between charity and philanthropy, which has been implicit in so many other panels. For that purpose, we were pleased to have been able to persuade Ben Soskis to apply his newly-minted History PhD skills to that issue in the monograph before us.

The monograph is a fitting companion, I should add at this point, to Martin Morse Wooster's indispensable Bradley Center product, *Great Philanthropic Mistakes*. To help us explore this charity/philanthropy distinction, we are pleased to welcome not only Ben himself, but also Patty Stonesifer of Martha's Table and formerly of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. David Hammack, a historian at Case Western Reserve and finally, Scott Walter of the Capital Research Center. Not in that order, but those are the folks we are going to hear from and Ben, we will first hear from you.

BENJAMIN SOSKIS: First, I want to thank Bill and Kristen again, the whole Bradley Center for supporting this research and for hosting this event. I have been in the audience for many of these and I think we can all agree, this is one of the few places where you can get critical and respectful dialogue about philanthropy in the nonprofit sector.

It is a real honor for me to be up here, though something of a bittersweet one because I also realize that I will not have a chance to be up here again. I think it is fitting for us all to give Bill and Kristen some acknowledgment now of the terrific job that they have done. It is a real resource. [APPLAUSE]

I promise not to get too choked up over the course of the event. For now, I want to take a few minutes to give a brief overview of the monograph. And in a sense, I wrote it to provoke exactly the type of discussion that I hope we will have today.

The idea can be traced to repeated encounters in my research, the idea that philanthropy defines itself against charitable giving. Whatever philanthropy might be today, it is defined as not charity.

So with that pronouncement as the starting point, I wanted to do two things. The first was to trace the historical split between charity and philanthropy back to its origins, to the various nodes and historical moments where the two terms came to be defined against each other, the various ways in which each became known in opposition to the other.

These moments include, but are no means exhausted by, the early modern period with the growing secularization of relief, the Enlightenment, when the drive to rid the world of poverty and thus the need for charity itself flowered, the French Revolution, when its supporters embraced philanthropy and rejected charity, believing that citizens had a right to relief, while counter-revolutionaries charged that the love of all mankind eroded more parochial affections, love of home, love of nation, love of neighbor, and ultimately subverted human nature itself.

I give most of my attention to the final decades of the nineteenth century in the United States, a period that witnessed the growth of the scientific charity movement, an effort to rationalize and to discipline charitable giving. The period also witnessed the enormous growth of industrial fortunes that produced the first great wave of what we now think of as modern philanthropy and those general purpose grant-making institutions, the foundations that pursued the welfare of all mankind.

It is at this moment, I argue, in the heart of the first Gilded Age, that the split between charity and philanthropy becomes the chasm that we are all familiar with today.

So how did the advocates of the ascendant ethic of philanthropy understand charity? According to its champions, philanthropy was efficient, whereas most charitable giving was wasteful. Philanthropy would turn its attentions to regional, national and even global problems, while charity's scope was parochial.

Philanthropy was big and bold and charity was small and timid. Philanthropy would address root causes, whereas charitable giving was preoccupied with palliatives. Philanthropy would be governed by rational analysis and the sober calculations of the board room and the laboratory, whereas charitable giving was prompted by sentimental impulses.

Philanthropy would do away with the very need for charity. It was a supersessionist crusade in many respects, whereas charity was inherently conservative and accepted as a base level of neediness and of suffering as God given, providentially mandated.

I think we all probably recognize that critique in some form, but we might not be as familiar with the perspective from the other side of the divide, and here again is where I think a little history comes in handy, for at precisely the same moment when modern philanthropy was defining its own prerogatives by critiquing charity, defenders of charity were developing a counter-critique of their own which distanced itself against philanthropy.

At the forefront of these defenders were Catholics, who could call on deep reserves of theological justifications for corporeal works of mercy. Charity in their understanding was sensitive to the immediate needs of suffering individuals, whereas philanthropy, for all its professed love of mankind, tended to hold man himself in contempt.

As one nineteenth century Catholic writer quipped, “Philanthropy’s efforts to eliminate poverty often began with the effort to banish actual poor people from one’s estate.” Charity was warm-hearted, while philanthropy tended to be cold and calculated. Charity did not judge the needy, whereas philanthropy often condescended to them.

Charity sought to honor the sacred bond between benefactor and beneficiary, whereas philanthropic ultimately poisoned it. Charity was fundamentally religious, philanthropy was secular. Charity could function outside the demands of the marketplace, whereas philanthropy was a creature of capitalism.

Over the course of my research, I did come to appreciate the utility of this antagonism, the way it helped to clarify the various responsibilities and distinctive imperatives of charity and philanthropy. But I also became convinced of its limitations, of the way in which an emphasis on the split could blind devotees of one to the legitimate critiques of the other.

I became convinced as well, and I think the historical record confirms this for me, that both charity and philanthropy were stronger, were more secure, more responsible, when they were braced and buttressed by the challenge the other offered, so I didn’t just want to utilize history to illuminate the split between philanthropy and charity, I also thought that history could instruct us on how we might bridge that divide.

At the turn of the last century, these bridges were well-traveled. A corps of pioneering philanthropists acknowledged the rebuke represented by charity, while some of the age’s most devout defenders of charity recognized the value of philanthropy’s critique. Each did not deny the tensions between philanthropy and charity, but sought to cultivate them, to turn the two moral imperatives into productive, if wary, partners.

I focus first in the monograph on the leaders of the charity organization movement, which had its start in England in the late 1860s and took root in the US by the end of the following decade. The charity organization movement dedicated itself to eradicating the scourge of indiscriminate giving and supplied many of the theories of giving that informed the early modern

philanthropists. Rockefeller was a major funder. The Russell Sage Foundation was also a leader of the movement.

Charity organization harbored a pronounced repressive strain and its early efforts emphasized the weeding out of undeserving applicants for relief and the exposure of charitable frauds, but the suspiciousness of traditional alms giving had a more progressive bent and ultimately led to support for broader societal and environmental reforms that eliminated the need for charity by addressing the root causes of poverty, to the work of what became known scientific philanthropy.

At the same time, the leaders of the movement insisted that their true aim was to rehabilitate true charity, to rescue the charitable relationship from the indignities of anonymous urban life. They championed the use of friendly visitors, volunteer men and mostly women who would call upon the poor in their homes, and besides performing a thorough investigation of what they found there, would also develop a close and personal bond with their charges. These visitors would provide an essential counterweight to the professional and bureaucratic callousness which could afflict the movement.

There were strong paradoxes and tensions between these positions, which most of the perceptive leaders of the movement appreciated, and as you know, most modern historians have lit upon. But these leaders seemed willing to accept the tensions as the price of resisting the popular notion that philanthropy and charity were ultimately antagonistic.

Mary Richman, for instance, a leader of the movement and one of the founders of professional social work, pushed back against those who saw what she called wholesale and retail reform as incompatible ends. She complained about the ardent reformer who insisted that hours spent writing a letter to a senator lobbying for progressive legislation would do more good than days spent in retail service working for the immediate needs of the poor. After all, she argued, those who had come in close personal contact with the suffering of the poor were ten times as likely to write that kind of letter in the first place.

At their best, charity organization proponents recognized the value of seeing both charity's limitations, and thus the need for philanthropy, and charity's essential promise. In the words of the movement's first historian, which I chose as a title for the monograph, they understood that the end and aim of all charity is no charity. In another sense, the end and aim of all charity is more charity. It's a motto that all of us would do well to ponder.

I think that general idea was embraced as well by a corps of early twentieth century Catholic charity reformers, men like William Kirby and John Ryan, who I also highlight in the monograph, along with the work of the leading Catholic lay charitable group, the Society of St. Vincent DePaul. They insisted that Catholics must not sheathe Catholics critical power and must continue to call out the dangers of reliance on secular philanthropy.

They also pushed their co-religionists to expand Catholic charity's individualistic orientation to address broader societal conditions and to endorse reforms such as unemployment insurance, minimum wages, and the regulations against child labor.

These reformers acknowledged that an embrace of the providential nature of poverty, which allowed the blessings of charity, could mask unworthy reactionary tendencies. The leading journal of the Catholic charity reformers, for instance, banned invocations of the biblical dictum, “the poor you will always have with you,” which frequently accompanied defenses of Catholic charitable giving, arguing that it promoted “bad logic, bad social philosophy, bad excuses, and bad apologetics.”

The reason why I thought it was so important to focus on these bridge builders of the past was that the distance today between philanthropy and charity now seems as wide as ever, in part because in so many intellectual provinces, philanthropy seems to be the only legitimate paradigm with which to engage voluntary giving.

Philanthropy’s status and supreme confidence has been bolstered by a faith in market-based approaches to social ills, by the spread of an entrepreneurial ethos that fuels big, ambitious schemes of social uplift, and by the concentration of wealth that has provided men and women with the resources to make good on those ambitions.

But those ambitions rarely take in the more modest promptings of charity. As one study from the Indiana University Center of Philanthropy has recently suggested, the wealthier a giver, the less likely he or she is to donate charities directed toward meeting the basic needs of the poor.

As I suggested before, I think this gap between philanthropy and charity is a real problem for all of us who care about the sector, since each has so much to learn from the other. But in my monograph, I also suggest some intimations of the resurgence of charity as an oppositional ethic.

Again, the stronger that charity is in this role, the more secure the bridge becomes between charity and philanthropy. The recent pronouncement of Popes Benedict and Francis, for instance, in which charity stands against the excess of the bureaucratic state or of the deified markets.

The Great Recession has also sparked another rediscovery of poverty and has led some philanthropists to direct funding to social service organizations and has led many nonprofits to couple social service provision with advocacy. An ethic of charity has provided an alternative framework for some seeking to check the advance of strategic philanthropy, one that counsels a measure of humility and calls for more openness to the perspective of grantees and less assuredness of foundation infallibility.

Admittedly, the monograph did not dwell on how this wary partnership between charity and philanthropy would look in practice. I am interested to get your thoughts about that. But it did end with an individual who I think is doing her part to cultivate that partnership, and that is Patty Stonesifer.

I will let her speak more about her move from the Gates Foundation to Martha’s Table, but one point that I wanted to make now is that in the press, this transition was often described as a sort of rebuke or repudiation, but I think if you pay attention to how Patty herself describes it, it was not, or at least it was not mainly that. It was more like a mediation.

She had taken lessons that she learned at the world's largest foundation and is applying them at a local pantry and food services organization. In other words, she was demonstrating in her own commitments that it was possible, without too much strain, to seek more charity and the end of charity at the same time. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

DAVID HAMMACK: I want to begin also by thanking the Hudson Institute, the Bradley Center, and Bill Schambra for organizing this event and including me. It is very hard to believe that the Bradley Center is ending because it has done such an excellent job of bringing people together from such a wide range of fields, a contribution very much in the spirit of both charity and philanthropy.

I also want to thank Ben Soskis for proposing today's topic and writing such a learned, thoughtful and provocative essay about charity and philanthropy. I hope what he said now will encourage those who haven't yet read it to look at it in detail.

I'd like to make just three suggestions about our topic. These have to do with our reasons for consulting history on such matters, with different definitions of charity and with what charity and/or philanthropy might achieve in the US and what we might want them to achieve.

If I read Ben's paper correctly, he argues here that a study of history can help us reflect on our own motives and purposes for engaging in the giving of time and treasure. Historical investigation can help us consider what we really want to accomplish through our strategies and plans and to think whether we are paying appropriate attention to the humanity of those we aim, directly and indirectly, to assist. Ben's paper seems to me excellent in arguing for this use of history.

I suggest that history can also be used to help us think about the larger organization of society as a whole and about the ways in which society and government shape options and hence, can help us think about possible implications of possible changes in policy and law. Maybe that will bring us back to the Hudson Institute's concern with policy and the ways in which policy and law shape charity in the United States.

Regarding definitions, I think Ben does a really wonderful job of explicating the distinction between charity and philanthropy that was drawn by Andrew Carnegie and elaborated by several others at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. I applaud his extended discussion of the ways in which Catholics have objected to the critical definition of charity as being an incomplete discussion.

I would add that Christians long distinguished between works of corporeal charity or mercy, and works of spiritual charity or mercy. I want to call attention to that distinction. Corporeal charity meets the need of the body for drink, food, clothing, shelter and care during incarceration and illness and in death.

In Christian thinking, there is also spiritual charity, to instruct the ignorant, counsel the doubtful, admonish sinners, bear wrongs patiently, forgive offenses willingly, comfort the afflicted and

pray for the living and the dead. To carry out spiritual works of charity, it is necessary to support, as the Elizabethan statute of charitable use has put it in Britain's turn to a sort of Protestant version of Christianity, it is necessary to support schools of learning, free schools, scholars at universities, churches, education and preferment of orphans, maintenance for houses of correction and other objects of that sort.

For many people educated within a tradition that places an emphasis on teaching and learning, on careful and disciplined thought, on engaging others, it is and has been charitable to build institutions and to celebrate valued principles. Those who live within such traditions have learned patience, not only in bearing wrongs, but in seeking to persuade others and accepting delays.

In any case, in practice, the legal definition of charity in the United States has long included gifts to underwrite spiritual acts of charity. These include support for religious houses of worship, for religious schools and seminaries for students, teachers and religious officials.

A big part of the story of charity or philanthropy, not only in the nineteenth century but down to the present, has to do with giving in small amounts and large, for immediate use and also for endowments, for Protestant dominations, for Catholic institutions, for individual congregations and branches of Judaism and to the many smaller religious communities.

The end result intended by such giving might be an increase in individual benevolence and caring, but the immediate purposes often have to do with bricks and mortar, with scholarship and retirement funds with endowments.

At the end of the nineteenth century, some of the biggest individual donors continued to support religious purposes, religious institutions and schools sponsored by religious institutions, but others feared that Protestant denominations had perhaps become both too successful and too quarrelsome, both within themselves and with others.

Debates over those questions, it seems to me, lay behind the creation of the charity organization movement and much of the enthusiasm for philanthropy. As Ben notes, their critics, Protestant as well as Catholic, relied on definitions of charity that included acts for the spirit as well as for the body.

I want to end by noting yet another use of history, to advocate for norms, for ideas as to what everyone should do through persuasion, public opinion or perhaps by encouraging a change in the laws regulating and shaping charity. It seems to me that has been a lively topic in recent years. In the US, the First Amendment has been the cornerstone for charity and philanthropy and that by emphasizing the ideals separating church and state, allowing the freedom to believe or not to believe, to speak, publish and advocate, US Law is militated against establishing any single orthodoxy.

The result has been what can be seen as a glorious confusion or a cacophony of voices. Among the positives, we might perhaps count America's ability to not only develop multiple religious

movements but also to contain and limit religious conflict, despite the variety and often strong disagreements among those committed to different faiths and philosophies.

Perhaps we might also attribute to that sort of freedom the vitality and success of many of the institutions in the United States, including our contending and far from satisfactory colleges and universities. If that sort of reading of history is valid, then we might ask whether efforts to establish any single standard for charity or philanthropy or for the laws that regulate and govern those practices would be a good thing. [APPLAUSE]

SCOTT WALTER: I'm going to follow my colleagues here and before I jump into this discussion, it would be a failure of charity and of justice if I didn't say a word about Bill Schambra and his work here at the Bradley Center. Bill has given generously to all of us and the entire nonprofit sector from his own intellect, but he has also given us something painfully rare in this sector, and that is thoughtful criticism and serious debate.

To the shame of our sector, there is hardly anything that matches the 148 panels that Bill has provided from this agora [APPLAUSE] but beyond that, Bill has not only provided an invaluable forum for philanthropic critique, he has also practiced it personally, going like Daniel into such dens of lions as the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* and even the board rooms of billion-dollar foundations.

His personal scholarship has given us all much to ponder and I know that I, who first met Bill in the summer of 1983 at AEI, can say that the relationship between my musings on all things charitable and communal on the one hand and Bill's wisdom on the other resembles what Emerson said of philosophy after Plato, "just footnotes to the master."

Now, turning to the Benjamin Soskis's monograph, it is an excellent piece of work from which I learned a great deal. I know Bill especially wanted me to comment on the Catholic portions, since my own study of Catholic social teaching began that same summer of 1983 at AEI, and here too, I have only praise for Ben's work, although I will add just a little bit of extra material later on.

My highest praise of Soskis's work would be that it exemplifies that Catholic inclination to prefer both/and to either/or. Soskis invokes both/and in his very title, and throughout his essay he shows it is better to have both charity and philanthropy rather than to set them at odds with one another.

In addition to praising his work, I want to ask Soskis a few questions that this good work raised in my mind, these may aid in our discussion, and then I will add a few thoughts on other readings and other Catholic material.

My first question would be to ask for a bit more specifics on just how charity can help correct philanthropy. As Soskis writes, "philanthropy is more secure when supported by charity's correctives and charity is stronger when braced by philanthropy's critiques." I agree but many devils are in the detail.

My second question follows from this. How specifically can philanthropy correct charity? Reading between the lines of Soskis, I think I see three possibilities hinted at and I would enjoy hearing his thoughts on them. First, it is a question of scale; philanthropy urges charity to think big. Second, it's a question of where you aim your help, at the causes of suffering or the symptoms. And third, it's a question of where the sources of suffering and disorder lie, in the human heart or in social arrangements.

Sometimes I have the sense in Soskis that for him, that last option C is a major concern. He seems to say, you aren't entirely serious about or comprehending of suffering if you aren't putting a significant part of your effort into changes in social arrangements. I don't say that's entirely wrong-headed, but I would argue that it brings into view a dangerous road, that if we follow too far, will lead to the worst excesses of philanthropy, what Edmund Burke called, "the homicidal philanthropy of France."

My last question for Soskis would be, may we have some more specifics on the role that social science should play in balancing charity and philanthropy? He mentions social science only once in his main text in the context of Mary Richmond seeking a middle ground between charity and philanthropy.

So those are my questions. Let me turn to a few exhortations for further reading. I want to first thank Soskis for some excellent sources his paper led me and perhaps the rest of us to consider. First, the Mary Richmond materials he cites paint a richer and more interesting picture than we usually receive of this large and pivotal figure. She is not simply the pioneer of the professional charity worker guided solely by social science, which is the popular legend about her.

Second, I would urge wider reading of the nineteenth century materials Soskis cites from Orestes Brownson. Even an overzealous Catholic like myself, who for some years received his salary from a nonprofit named after Brownson, hasn't read widely enough in this important Catholic convert and pioneer. Brownson has a taste for the polemical, but he is a deep thinker and a provocative observer of America.

Let me recommend a few other readings which Soskis lacked the space to explore or that go a bit afield from his focused topic. First, Tocqueville and not just his famous *Democracy in America*, which outlines how a modern liberal republic can flourish and overcome a selfish individualism, but also his other masterpiece, *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, which explains how France was the failed mirror opposite of America, which thanks to the contempt for one's countrymen bred by an over-centralized government, exterminated the habits and even the capacity of citizens to come to each other's aid.

Another important Tocqueville reading is his brief *Memoir on Pauperism*, which was reprinted some years back with an invaluable introduction by Gertrude Himmelfarb. In that work, Tocqueville contrasts private and public charity with a preference for private.

And speaking of Himmelfarb, no one interested in our topic should fail to read her two great histories on that topic as it played out in Britain both before and during the period that Soskis

covers in America. First, there is her *The Idea of Poverty: England in the Early Industrial Age* and second, *Poverty and Compassion: The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians*.

I would note in passing that Himmelfarb shows the harm done by Thomas Malthus, who propagated bad social science in both the moral and statistical senses and went on to influence the gruesome Eugenical philanthropists of the twentieth century.

Another author to read, Marvin Olasky, mentioned in passing by Soskis in his monograph, shouldn't be missed, especially his archival history of the early centuries of America, *The Tragedy of American Compassion*, written, I believe, thanks to a year's fellowship from the Bradley Foundation.

It goes without saying that Bill Schambra's writings on philanthropy and social science and the search for the root causes of poverty shouldn't be missed, but in addition to these more negative critiques, let me urge everyone to read Bill's 2009 Bradley lecture at AEI, "*Conservatism and the Quest for Community*," because it gives Bill's history of the positive alternative that he favors, namely strong self-healing local communities and nonprofits.

Another great source of wisdom on the decline and future promise of what we in America call the "independent sector" is the work of the man who coined that term, the late Richard Cornuelle. Since he is so little known, let me give you a little taste of his thought from a 1999 talk The Philanthropy Roundtable titled "[De-Nationalizing Community](#)."

Philanthropy was, from the beginning, enthusiastically involved in the project to nationalize community. It financed the studies that documented the presumed inadequacies of primary and voluntary institutions. It trained the specialized professionals who now comprise what critics call "the new class." It financed the new institutions that devised the step-by-step centralization of responsibility.

Early on, philanthropy moved from providing direct services to advocacy, dutifully and consistently advocating transfers of responsibility to more monopolistic, centralized, professionalized, and authoritarian institutions. In the 1950s and 1960s, I was a "philanthropoid." Then, it was simply understood that philanthropy's task was to lubricate transfers of responsibilities to ever more remote and authoritarian institutions.

For those who want an accessible yet knowledgeable introduction to the understanding of charity in the Jewish and Christian scriptures, I recommend Gary Anderson's recent book *Charity*, which concentrates on the term in the Old and New Testaments but also follows it into the Middle Ages and the Reformation, where changing views presaged some of today's secular ideas of philanthropy.

Before I turn to my final remarks on Catholic sources, I want to stress the value of a landmark essay that Soskis cites, Brian Anderson's criticism of the American nonprofit known as Catholic Charities in City Journal. It has the revealing title, "[How Catholic Charities Lost Its Soul](#)."

In this vein, I can't help adding that you shouldn't miss Daniel Patrick Moynihan's [speech](#) at the inaugural meeting of the group Independent Sector in early 1980, also available on the Philanthropy Roundtable's website. The very Irish Moynihan was disturbed that in that very year, "For the first time, more than 50 percent of its (Catholic Charities) budget came from government. More than half. In time, there cannot be any outcome to that encroachment save governmental control."

And now, just a few quick Catholic quotations to add to Ben's good work. He mentions Pope Francis briefly and I wanted to add three brief quotes that show what I think is actually a theme of his papacy and reveal that he is not a conventional liberal, no matter how much the *New York Times* editorial page may like to think.

In his very first homily as Pope, he cites three scripture readings and says that their themes are walking, building and professing, and then he says, "Professing. We can walk as much as we want, we can build many things, but if we do not confess Jesus Christ, nothing will avail. We will become a pitiful NGO, but not the Church, the Bride of Christ. When one does not profess Jesus Christ, one professes the worldliness of the devil."

A little later at a general audience, Pope Francis explains, "Today I begin a new series of catecheses on the Church. To speak of the Church is to speak of our mother, of our family. The Church, in fact, is not an institution focused in on itself or a private association, an NGO."

And then lastly, this is just an impromptu talk that he gave, again the first year of his pontificate, this time at Rio de Janeiro at World Youth Day. Part of this is often quoted, "I want the Church to go out onto the streets. I want us to resist everything worldly, everything static, everything comfortable, everything to do with clericalism, everything that might make us closed in on ourselves. The parishes, the schools, the institutions are made for going out. If they don't, they become an NGO and the Church cannot be an NGO."

Okay, one more source. This doesn't make any appearance in Ben's monograph but I think it fits perfectly and should be added, and that is Mother Teresa, not an American but somebody widely-respected and read in America. In our own town, there is an AIDS hospice not far from here that her Missionaries of Charity run and they are now active in about 140 countries around the world.

In her famous talk at the National Catholic Prayer Breakfast, where you can see Bill and Hillary Clinton squirm as Mother talks, she said, sounding like Pope Francis,

We are not social workers. We may be doing social work in the eyes of some people, but we must be contemplatives in the heart of the world. For we are touching the body of Christ and we are always in His presence. You too must bring that presence of God into your family, for the family that prays together, stays together. There is so much hatred, so much misery, and we with our prayer, with our sacrifice, are beginning at home. Love begins at home, and it is not how much we do, but how much love we put into what we do. I want you to find the poor here, right in your own home first. And begin love there.

Be that good news to your own people first. And find out about your next door neighbors. Do you know who they are?

Similarly, she said in *No Greater Love*,

If someone feels that God wants from him a transformation of social structures, that's an issue between him and his God. We all have the duty to serve God where we feel called. I feel called to help individuals, to love each human being. I never think in terms of crowds in general but in terms of persons. Were I to think about crowds, I would never begin anything. It is the person that matters, I believe in person-to-person encounters. Never worry about numbers. Help one person at a time and always start with the person nearest you.

That is a daunting challenge to each one of us, each and every day, and it is not a final solution to the problem of suffering, but history has given us reason to be fearful of final solutions. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

PATTY STONESIFER: I asked to go last because I am the one that doesn't have the academic underpinnings to this work, but I have been well-informed and well-supported by those who do, so I will just add my thanks very briefly to Bill and Kristen and those who supported you in this important effort to increase the dialogue around the important issues of philanthropy during a period of historic growth in the sector where we all have much to learn.

I was a bit puzzled when first contacted about this paper, because I think in some ways, my own journey describes the fact that this isn't an either/or. Benjamin did a great job of explaining why in history, it was often set up as an either charity or philanthropy, but I think in practice, we have seen a lot of people that have made the journey from one to the other or have used their abilities up close with what you might call charity to inform those back further in the system with what you might call philanthropy.

My own path to this dais today is one that started with 20 years in the business sector. In my family, which was Catholic activist in the Midwest, I was the sixth of nine children. I was deemed, when I went to work in the technology sector, the family capitalist. And I teasingly refer to myself as the family savings and loan because every family of hardcore Catholic activists actually needs a family savings and loan [LAUGHTER].

I came from a family that believed that their responsibility was in the way that they moved through this world and they acted every day in that fashion, whether that was in creating soup kitchens or grocery pantries or in serving the Church in other fashions. I went on to distance myself at some level from the theology but continued with the social beliefs of my parents.

I always believed in two strong values, one was social justice and the other one was increasing knowledge. I believe that the opportunity for the tech sector in the 70s, 80s and 90s to increase knowledge was far greater than any of us have in the philanthropic sector, absent perhaps higher education in the social sector.

I was proud to be part of building that engine and equally saw my responsibility still to be up close with the needs in the community in Seattle, as well as back to the system level with building software that would reach around the world and change lives in ways that none of us even dreamed at the time.

But it was in the fact that my children and I were still involved in the daily activities of ensuring that groceries reached those in need that drew Bill and Melinda Gates, who had become great friends, to ask me to join their father in creating what became the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, because they knew that I, with the work that I had done with them, could do the system.

I understood systems and how systems affect everything, from the way we create and sell software to the way we clothe, feed, support, and stand with the poor. That ability to both understand systems, something that Bill Gates understand better than anybody, besides his down-the-street neighbor Jeff Bezos or others of that nature, but also with a strong inclination to go in close. That is what we hoped to create at the Gates Foundation but with size and complexity comes a tendency to stay back at that system level.

I found the ability to touch so many systems, with the resources, the strategies, the partnerships and the institutions that Gates was able to partner with to affect the systems of vaccination, to affect the systems of micronutrient supplies, to affect the systems of transitional housing in Seattle, but I missed the opportunity to combine going in close with pulling back far.

In moving back to my roots at Martha's Table, I have been able to combine the best, I think in some ways, of both worlds. As Pope Francis says in one of the quotes that Benjamin references, he declares that life means, "working to eliminate the structural causes of poverty and to promote the integral development of the poor, as well as small daily acts of solidarity in meeting real needs which we encounter."

I have that privilege today. I can be here with you, thinking and informing and discussing the big systems of philanthropy and charity, and tonight, I'll be on the corner of Second and K administering to the needs of the poor or those with mental health or other problems that keep them from adequately addressing their own needs today for an evening meal.

Alongside of me tonight will be a very senior USDA official who is the person that is shaping the future of food stamps, and that is the special gift that I have been given. By being able to go down close and being able to pull back, it offsets some of the weaknesses of those who are in close every day. We are so good at the solidarity, at standing with the needs, but we sometimes don't have the luxury of stepping back to understand and reflect the way we are doing today.

I call my Sundays now, Strategy Sundays, because there is no strategy when you are worried about whether the brakes on the bus matters and whether the food from Chipotle has pork in it and a lot of the people won't eat the pork. The needs of these frontline organizations can be overwhelming and we need to encourage those who are up close to be able to spend and invest the time and give them the resources to reflect, to bring others close to the issue, and to build up the voices of those who have the issues.

You asked the critical question which is, how can philanthropy offset charity and how can charity help correct philanthropy? One of the things we really do need is, instead of talking to philanthropists and charitable givers, is to actually hear directly from those who we are talking about here.

For instance, at Martha's Table we recently received a small gift from a local philanthropist to build up an effort called Witness to Hunger, so that a dozen family leaders that we come into contact with regularly that experience monthly hunger, who are working by the way, they are the working poor, can be with me and stand with me in the circumstances that we have to share with you, what is the right philanthropic government business solution.

As a frontline organization, we can do that for philanthropy. And by the way, for government and for business, raise those voices, not just ours or Mother Teresa's, but raise the voices of those that are struggling to change their own system.

To go back to the system, I appreciated it that Ben understood when I said I'd had enough white papers and PowerPoint presentations to last a lifetime. The fault of those who work primarily in philanthropy is this issue of bureaucracy and standing back. It often keeps you away from understanding, what are the rocks in the pockets of those you serve?

I will use a very good example, which is in looking at changing agricultural productivity. One brilliant philanthropist gave money to develop a new form of bean that would be much more robust and produce much bigger crops, rolled it out, and then three years later he didn't understand why no one was using it.

The answer is, it takes four times as long to cook it. The time for cooking was more important than the time for planting. And the women were doing the planting, so the likelihood of being able to invest that in the cooking was an improper tradeoff.

That is why we need to invest in the frontline, that are truth-tellers, that are clear, that will measure, that will tell and that will speak truth to not just power but to all those who have an investment. At the same time, make sure that those who have the wealth to affect the system are learning directly from those in need and the organizations that serve them.

I think that is my role today, to be that person who is down close and who also has the privilege of seeing the system. So I thank you and everybody on the panel. [APPLAUSE]

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: Thank you, all. Let me, as is my custom, grab the privilege of the first question. And I try to stir things up a little bit, so this is going to be a little more sharply put than it might justify. Ms. Stonesifer, listening to your background, a lot of people in the sector today have had backgrounds similar to yours. However, young people are now going into institutions of higher education, coming out of service programs in which they get a particular kind of understanding of what service is about. They go to institutions of higher education where they are encouraged to enter into, let's say studies that are more concerned with the systems, right?

If you are an aspiring and ambitious young person, you are not absorbing Catholic social thought at the feet of your parents in a large family. In fact, you are learning about systems and how to manipulate them, and learning how to breed a bean that will be so much more effective than all the other beans out there in the world. They never encounter anyone along the way who will say to them that the women who are going to be cooking this bean don't want it. This has struck me in the course of the last ten years as being a problem that is getting worse.

We can talk about the balance between philanthropy and charity, and I know Ben, you talk about some hopeful signs, including Mrs. Stonesifer's career. and I think that is absolutely correct. However, for young people coming up today, isn't the aspiration to go from Harvard to the staff of the Gates Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation, and be the person who manipulates the systems, because that is where you can justify it to yourself by saying, this is obviously where I can do the most good, but in fact there is something of a power trip about that.

I just wonder, can we really be hopeful about this? Is there really a kind of return to the charitable critique, which was strong earlier because of the historical institutions that resisted philanthropy? I don't know that it is there anymore. What do you think about that? Isn't there, in fact, a radical imbalance on behalf of the philanthropic as opposed to the charitable?

PATTY STONESIFER: I do think, the tension given the last ten years to big new philanthropy is appealing, and there is certainly a large group of people who want to be part of that. It's nice to give away money, right? But the much bigger group that I see is young people as makers, young people as trying things. Whether they are creating a baby food company but part of their idea is that part of that baby food goes to a certain charity, or they are doing programming all day but doing social code work for organizations like Martha's Table at night.

We have 10,000 instances of service, if we could just absorb all the creative ways that people want to serve. What is the Uber of food matching between food surplus and need? They don't draw the bright lines that we have drawn here between charity and philanthropy.

They are socially engaged and see social engagement, whether they are a bond trader or going to work for the Gates Foundation, as intertwining the nature of social change and daily activity. For me, I don't see these young people making the bright line.

BENJAMIN SOSKIS: I do think there is an imbalance. I do think it is possible that social enterprise and discourse sometimes incorporates elements of direct personal contact with the poor, but I agree with Bill that the balance has probably shifted, at least in the ways people think about the sector and the ways that the leaders of the sectors talk about it, the ones at least who get the most ink. Philanthropy is dominant paradigm now.

My answer to that, I think, betrays my own academic background, which is, one way to address that is to have a little more historical imagination. New philanthropy is one of the oldest things there is. Philanthropy is always saying it is new, but I think this obsession with newness is linked to some of the lack of engagement with other ways, other means, other modes of thinking about the responsibility to do good.

Maybe because it is what I have been trained in, I do believe that encouraging people in the field to think a little bit about what has come before, what has worked and what hasn't worked, gives a sense of humility or a certain degree of modesty that balances some of the excesses of the philanthropic mindset.

I should say, though, that those ambitions and that hubris does have its place as well. You don't want to completely eliminate it. I think the main goal is to find the balance, a way of communicating between these two modes of thought and I think that history is at least one way of doing so.

DAVID HAMMACK: I am not sure how to respond to such a large question such as, what's wrong with young people today? That is a long standing concern [LAUGHTER]. I can mention a couple of concrete examples. One of my PhD students had a daughter who was really bright and capable and went to Yale, but she was born in China and she used to go back to Beijing and teach her grandparents' colleagues' children English in the summer and then come back, sort of an extraordinary background.

So after her first year at Yale, she went to a place in the west of China and was associated with a university where they were trying to introduce new crops. She immediately saw that the guys at the university were guys and they wanted to talk to men, but it was the women who actually planted things. She had no hesitation in confronting the guys at the university who outranked her by gender, by age and by position and explaining to them that they were missing the boat. She was perfectly confident in representing that view in exactly the way that you have described.

I hear the same kinds of things from graduate students in my classes at Case Western Reserve who are teaching in Cleveland or suburban schools, but who want to go on and get a doctorate. They are working with real people in front of them in their classes. If they don't respond to those real people, they cannot succeed. They can't even stay in the classroom.

I think one of the questions that your question raises is whether, as a society, we are paying enough attention to people in those kinds of situations and talking about the satisfaction that they can get. Also, as Patty is saying, giving them the opportunities on the weekends to reflect on what they are doing.

Maybe that is something that could call for more attention, but how do you distribute resources, that is the big system question, and there are never enough resources to do everything.

PATTY STONESIFER: Whenever a young person asks me about getting a job in philanthropy, I tell them to follow where the money goes, not where the money is given away. We stopped at one point with this issue, of everybody who had ever worked in health applying to the Gates Foundation as the ultimate way to play out their vision of a healthier world, and figured out that there were probably a thousand times more jobs we created in the field than the number of young people in academia.

So as these large organizations begin to distribute, the best way to get a job in the philanthropic world in most of these organizations is to go do a fabulous job someplace where you actually do learn something.

I hope you guys are wrong. [LAUGHTER] I think most philanthropies are taking seriously the need to keep having fresh water, and new people are coming in who bring different perspectives. It seems to me a critical answer and part of the reason that I left when I did.

BENJAMIN SOSKIS: How would you explain the small amount that philanthropy spends on direct social services to the poor?

PATTY STONESIFER: I think people are afraid. And by the way, it is not a small amount of dollars. It is a small amount compared to the bricks and mortar institutions where no one ever is embarrassed by that new computer science building; you are just not embarrassed by that.

There is some concern that the dollars given to Martha's Table for feeding the poor tonight are going to be gone tomorrow and then what is there then. Is this the right choice? I think that is a legitimate question for people to ask, which is, is this the right place in the system for me, my dollars, and my energy to intervene?

That said, we could tilt that. There are only so many opera halls that we need. We have determined that with the recession, that some of them that were built weren't actually needed. I think we do need to make sure that the social service area is a good and hearty place, and one of the things that has happened over the last decade, that philanthropy caused to happen at the frontline, was going from measuring what I call "seats and sandwiches," which is what we measured at Martha's Table, to measuring reduction in food insecurity or in what happened with literacy attainment as opposed to attendance. Those things really matter and I hope that philanthropists' will have the willingness to put real bucks behind it if they can see that the system actually changes with the investment.

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: Scott, do you want to say something, before we go to the audience?

SCOTT WALTER: Well, I don't have much to add to that. I would just add --

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: I am counting on you saying, 'Yes, there is an imbalance and philanthropy is a tyrannical enterprise!' echoing Orestes Brownson. [LAUGHTER]

SCOTT WALTER: Yes, that's easy. There certainly is an imbalance and it is going to be much worse without you manning that podium. However, I would add, Ben talked about the historical imagination being valuable and I thoroughly agree. I would just put in a plug, of course, for the religious imagination, purely on the empirical level.

That is to say, you don't have to believe any of the revelations, but it is simply true that religion provides great profundity in both theory and practice. There is the profound practice of the Missionaries of Charity at the AIDS hospice a few blocks from here. That is profound where practice is concerned.

There is also profundity at the level of theory; if you read Mother Teresa's thinking about what she does and why she does it, or if you read Orestes Brownson or Pope Francis or Pope Benedict. Just as an empirical matter, there is much for a young person to both think about and to imitate in daily life in both cases.

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: Gotcha. Okay, we have eight minutes left in the lifetime of the Bradley Center panel series.

PATTY STONESIFER: Oh my goodness, somebody ask something great.

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: We need some questions. Yes, this gentleman right here.

Q: Kieran Raval with American Philanthropic, LLC. If you are talking about the end times, I guess I will pose two particularly Catholic questions to Scott first and then maybe whoever wants to weigh in.

Do you see a shift in Catholic social teaching? Particularly I am thinking with the Second Vatican Council and at *Gaudium et Spes*, where there is talk of moving from the particular, moving to a wider scope, where there is talk of global governance and these sorts of things. Do you see any shift there in the Council and any effect that has on the Catholic theory of charity and philanthropy from that point?

SCOTT WALTER: There certainly is some shifting. Ben, in his monograph, doesn't spend a lot of time with the Vatican II documents but he does talk about Paul VI who was the second of the two Popes during Vatican II and his encyclical, *Populorum Progressio*, a few years after Vatican II, which is in a sense the most extreme on the systems side of things.

I think with John Paul II and with Benedict, and even arguably with Francis, you see a much greater stress on personal charity without denying the importance of the larger picture. Partly because, Bill, they realized the same way you do in our modern discourse, there is an enormous emphasis on the big picture and a neglect of the person to person, at least in what we say, maybe not in what we do.

Q: Yes, Bob Woodson, Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. I was intrigued with your example of the philanthropist investing a lot of money in growing beans. I believe that that's a pervasive attitude toward the poor, from both philanthropists on the right and left. They parachute into low-income communities with remedies designed by them and others at the universities, with the expectation that the poor participate, and when they fail, there is never an examination of the intervention. The assumption is, it was a poor investment.

I am just wondering how pervasive you think that problem is and what is being done or discussed about really listening to the people suffering the problem for the remedies, as opposed to being imposed from well-intentioned but ill-informed interventions? We say that you can waste millions if it well managed by well-credentialed people. [LAUGHTER]

PATTY STONESIFER: I think you answered your own question, it is a problem. But it is also a problem that a lot of people are working to solve. When we did work with sex workers in India, obviously you can lay out the best plan in the world, but the best people that would understand how to affect sex workers and AIDS were the sex workers. They taught us a tremendous amount about where to put our resources and how to spread the word, and it was successful, I believe, because of that. I do see that happening in a lot of places, but never enough.

And then in other places, it's just endless discussions at the community level without real solutions orientation. We have to not just say, we have to listen to everybody, but we need to listen to everybody with the ability to create a shared solution that we then go implement, because you can talk forever.

I do think philanthropists are asking these questions and doing pilots, not all of them, but sometimes doing pilots before doing rollouts for the very reason you are talking about. We need more understanding of what really is the positive and negative of any given intervention before we then try to scale it at a very large level.

BENJAMIN SOSKIS: I think the history here is interesting. If you look back at the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, there was a general fear that the charitable relationship itself would be demeaning to the poor. This came from both the right and the left, and the solution to this was to transactionalize, to make the charitable exchange into a market exchange by various means.

I think that, to some extent, has defined a lot of the ways that philanthropists and charity organizations have thought about their endeavors. There was a fear that givers had too much power and there was something sort of problematic about that top-down dynamic. In the course of that transformation, the integrity of the charitable relationship was compromised a bit.

It is not easy to listen to people. It takes more than just market testing. It's a real project that has to be believed in. I do think that charity, an ethic of charity, the language it uses, the associations it has, can help all of us to really believe that.

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: One thing that history might contribute, this has been a pet peeve of mine which I of course drag out at every opportunity, simply the history of philanthropic efforts to help the poor in any given situation, we have histories of the War on Poverty and so forth with some account of what the Ford Foundation did, but what we need, I think, in this area are city-level histories of all of the enterprises that have been launched with such great high hopes.

They are going to transform the way we work with low-income people in Milwaukee, Chicago, Cincinnati, wherever. The press releases document the entry onto the scene, they quietly don't do anything and kind of disappear, and there is no sense of history about it, right? The next person comes on the scene and looks around and assumes that this has never been tried, because of course, there isn't any historical account that says, well, other than those seven other times, it is a great new idea.

This is one of the reasons why I am particularly pleased that we are talking about the history of the discipline in this last panel.

BENJAMIN SOSKIS: Do you know any funders?

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: That's always the question! Nobody wants to fund that history. It's amazing, all of those histories. We have time for one more quick question, and yes, young lady back there.

Q: Hi, Erica Walter. I wanted to pick up on your point you made just now, Mr. Schambra, about the seven previous times that a foundation would have invested in a system and failed and to intersect it, with Patty's point about learning directly from the truth-tellers from those in need.

What happens when we don't pay attention to the truth-tellers and we continue, as philanthropists, to fund a bankrupt system, say like the public schools where people like Taylor Swift, who just announced that all the profits from her latest single are going to go to directly into the New York City public school system, like the Walton Foundation, etc. That issue in particular, we don't seem to learn the lesson. We keep funding it and we are not listening to those in need, who are the children who are telling us in various ways, the system is failing us. I would just like your comments on that.

SCOTT WALTER: The history of the Annenberg Challenge is the most famous funding disaster of this particular sort, namely of public education, that has been chronicled somewhat by the Fordham Institute in several of the cities where it was tried. Very little came of the billion dollars that was sunk into it.

PATTY STONESIFER: And honestly, using Taylor Swift as an example, the media likes to cover what is new, especially if it is associated with a bright lights name. It would be great if five years from now, someone tried to measure whether that money did go to the schools and did it have an impact, and if somehow that knowledge could be seen.

I do think it is one of the beauties of current technology, that information will be accessible. I can guarantee you someone is going to ask and follow that question, and hopefully, future philanthropists, future Taylor Swifts, will wonder whether or not that mattered.

Now, the first thing they may wonder is, how many Google hits did I get on that announcement today, but let's presume good intentions and say she really wants it to affect children's lives, and that should be knowable with the level of transparency and interactivity that we have.

I'm optimistic that more of our lessons, as long as we have opportunity to reflect on them, more of our lessons will be knowable in the future, more of our histories. There isn't much that Gates is doing that someone isn't obsessively tracking right now, right? That is a good thing, when that much money is in one place. It's a very good thing. They don't think it's a good thing from day to day and I'm sure I didn't when I was the one in charge from day to day, but over the long arc of history, that is going to be a very good thing.

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: John gets the last question since he represents Hudson, which has put up with the Bradley Center for so many years.

JOHN WALTERS: I actually want to take that in a different direction. I wanted to take this opportunity on behalf of Hudson, my colleagues here at the Institute, to thank Bill and his partnership with Bradley, his colleagues. He has brought some of you in this room, who have been willing to think about what is going on in philanthropy, what we can do and what we can't do, to take some of the issues that are underneath the act of caring for our fellow human beings and to make us think more seriously about them, relentlessly make us think more seriously about them.

I have never actually talked to a donor who said, I was offended by something that Bill did and I don't like Hudson as a result. They may be offended by it, but I think his intelligence, the kind of people in this room he has brought to the fore, and asked the questions that everybody knows are serious, if they are thoughtful, and I want to thank him.

Also, this panel has made me think about the contrast that he has insisted on bringing, correctly, to this. Far be it from me to take a different track from Taylor Swift, but I can't help but in this season think of *It's a Wonderful Life*. It is not the measures that you think of in quantitative philanthropy. The measures may be the changes in people's lives that the most profound but are not measured, not even seen.

Bill has made us not forget that, and I believe that is a great service. It is sad on this day to think that that will not be as frequent, though I still have hopes of enticing him back for occasional, out of retirement tours on topics that will still be enduring. Thank you, Bill, for what you have done for all of us. [APPLAUSE]

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: Thank you so much. Thank you all for coming. You have been, over the years, a great audience. What they call in Seattle, the Twelfth Man. I couldn't have done it without you. Thank you very much.