A Future Filer

Robert L. Payton

1995

I write these words in a cafe in Gdansk in Poland. It has just turned 12 noon and the bells of a hundred churches have begun to ring. For some of us, the persistence of religion under Communist oppression is a sign of the strength of the idea of voluntary association. It is perhaps symbolically significant also that this is written in the very city where Solidarity was born.

The question now is whether the culture of Eastern Europe will change. Will the tradition we call philanthropy emerge as a third sector alongside government and the private economic marketplace? It might be argued that the concept of a three-sector society is essential to democracy; that democracy is essential to the well-being of the people in eastern Europe; and that the well-being of eastern Europe is important to the well-being of the rest of the world, including the United States.

The concept of the three-sector society is the most important contribution of the Filer Commission. What a second Filer Commission might investigate and propose about "private philanthropy and public needs" is the subject of this informal and personal essay. The style is informal and personal so that no one will mistake it for claiming more authority than that of one interested observer. That observer also confesses that this essay is an exercise in “mythistory," a term coined by historian William McNeill to refer to the way we blend historical evidence with stories we tell about the past; we then use the resulting mythistory to shape the present and the future.

In my version of recent American history, I credit the Filer Commission with contributing to mythistory by adding the concept of the three-sector society to the public discourse. Because of Filer, I argue, we see the United States through a different lens than we did before the Commission on Private Philanthropy and. Public Needs. In providing us with that concept, "Filer" (referring to the

commission and not simply to its chair) gives us a way of thinking that makes the role of philanthropy visible as well as important to democracy and to the free society. Put in those terms, philanthropy can no longer be dismissed as peripheral or inconsequential.

The reason there was a Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs was that John D. Rockefeller III and some other people sensed that American philanthropy was more important than most Americans realized. They proved their point. Whatever else may be said about the efforts of the past twenty years, we now have a conceptual grip on the scale and scope of the voluntary sector. The sector is clearly more important and more complex than anyone realized before the Commission did its work.

But if the Filer Commission made philanthropy important, it also made it a target for critics. Many of us have spent the past twenty years arguing the case for philanthropy -- against Marxists, libertarians, Stanley Surrey liberals, Ernest Istook conservatives, and a host of other cultured despisers, cynics, or True Believers. We have had to face charges that philanthropy is a tool of American imperialism, American religion, American culture, and American business. Once a target for liberals (because it takes the heat of f government to deal with social problems), it is now a target for conservatives (because it puts the heat <u>on</u> government to deal with social problems).

Philanthropy is praised for its high aspirations to make the society more compassionate and to strengthen community. But philanthropy is also often criticized for raising money, for earning money, and for receiving government assistance. And for charging overhead. A second Filer Commission should engage more directly than did Filer I with the ideological critiques, both Left and Right, both political and economic, both philosophical and religious.

But the first task of the next Filer Commission -- perhaps of any future Filer Commission -- will be to examine the state of what Filer I called "the ageless

rationale" for philanthropy in America. Giving in America listed the following nine "underlying functions of voluntary groups" and concluded that-these provided the "ageless rationale" for philanthropy:

- Initiating new ideas and processes
- Developing public policy
- Supporting minority or local interests
- Providing services that the government is constitutionally barred from providing
- Overseeing government
- Overseeing the marketplace
- Bringing the sectors together
- Giving aid abroad
- Furthering active citizenship and altruism

The rationale for philanthropy is, in fact, neither ageless nor widely shared and it would be a serious mistake to take the rationale for granted. While these general functions are still relevant, the attack on the second one -- "developing public policy" -- indicates how vulnerable the rationale continues to be. It is always susceptible to changing social conditions.

What has been called a "defining moment" in American political history may have begun in November 1994 with the election of a new Republican majority in Congress. The most important consequence of this historical moment for the third sector will be changed assumptions about the roles of each of the three sectors. The boundaries between philanthropy and government and between philanthropy and the marketplace will be redrawn. The roles of each sector will be redefined more precisely -- or rather, will continue to be redefined, because "privatization" and other trends have been underway for some time. Filer II will confront a three-sector society with increasingly permeable boundaries between sectors.

How much have privatization and other boundary shifts already changed the profile? It appears that some functions can be reassigned from the first sector (government) to the second (marketplace) without affecting philanthropy much at all. The third sector has encroached on the second in its effort to generate new sources of income. For years for-profit health club competitors have complained about the tax advantages of the YMCA; others have complained about the sale of computers by campus bookstores, or about the sale of art objects by museums -- and other scandalous behavior.

At the same time, and more immediately pertinent, recent years have seen state and local governments, even the federal government, launch philanthropic fund raising efforts. Many public school districts now follow the lead of public higher education, and such venerable institutions as the National Park Service and all of its state and local counterparts now raise funds from private gifts. Political parties and candidates form tax-exempt 501(c) (3) think tanks and similar spin-offs, which also compete for philanthropic dollars.

This competition for funds, both between and within sectors, is intensified by the newly amassed fortunes of the present generation. We are on the verge of a historic transfer of wealth from this generation to the next, which will have-important implications for philanthropy.

Other changes already made, or under consideration, in public policy areas such as welfare, health, and the environment, will alter the respective functions of the sectors and raise expectations of the role of philanthropy. Present efforts to reduce regulation and federal intervention in those areas promise a new role for philanthropy.

Tax policy affecting philanthropy, a preoccupation of Filer I, will clearly remain on any philanthropic agenda, perhaps even more centrally if there is a move to use tax policy to change giving patterns. One difference is that now the third sector beginning with Independent Sector and other new or revitalized organizations -- is

much better prepared to express whatever agreement or consensus among its member organizations it might be able to achieve. Whether it's the charitable deduction, postal rates, or advocacy, the third sector claims a right to be heard and to have its needs balanced against other claims.

The new historical moment may also affect the third sector's reliance on government. By this I do not mean the familiar complaint that voluntary associations become dependent on government financial assistance. There is a greater concern: that third sector organizations have relied too much on government to convert third-sector goals into public realities. I accept the recent observation that environmental organizations effectively abandoned the responsibility for the environment to the government. The very broad popular base that supported pollution control and conservation eroded as third sector activism on behalf of environmental protection and preservation gave way to administrative and judicial control.

The ancient and historic strategy of using voluntary action to shape public policy needs to be re-examined, both by its critics and by its advocates. The problems appear not only in unstable and vulnerable policy; they may undermine voluntary organization and commitment.

Turning from the relationships among the sectors to concerns internal to the third sector, let me begin with a concern expressed recently by a colleague: he believes that the sector is a victim of over-proliferation of organizations. Along with others, he foresees a difficult period of downsizing, retrenchment, mergers and closures. Third sector organizations are competing for attention and resources; their increased number intensifies the competition, and the successful organizations are those that are financially and organizationally stronger.

If there has been any important change in the third sector over the past twenty years, it has been the adoption of marketplace techniques to improve management. The familiar consequence of this process is that organizations take on marketplace

values along with marketplace techniques. The urgency and importance of mission is subordinated to economic survival skills. Measurable outcomes become more important than those that are more difficult or impossible to measure.

There has been considerable progress on evaluation and accountability as well as on most other aspects of nonprofit management. Concerns about evaluation follow directly from the Filer Commission and other efforts to achieve accountability.

The problematic concept of evaluation is more important to the third sector now than it has ever been. It is on grounds of poor management, inefficiency, loose discipline, and other blights of organizational life that most donors have insisted on change. Donors from the local United Way to the World Bank have increasingly tied continued support to management improvement. The emphasis on better management, combined with increasing competition among nonprofits, has pushed management to the center of third-sector consciousness.

Another increasing pressure is the increased availability and use of technology, and the increased specialization that goes with it. Fund raising offers generous evidence of both trends and of the problems as well as the accomplishments that result from them. Computer software has been developed for almost every nonprofit need, real or imagined. In fact, one measure of the threshold of economic survival may be whether an organization can afford to acquire and use -computers and software. My intuition tells me that reliance on technology is excessive and that some widely used fund raising techniques are counter-productive.

An underlying and important issue for me is whether philanthropy, especially in areas like fund raising and marketing, is beginning to behave too much like the marketplace. Has the third sector absorbed too many of the values of the marketplace in trying to make use of marketplace techniques?

There is also the matter of monitoring and regulating the third sector. Harvey Dale's serious challenge to philanthropy, that philanthropy is too large and too important to continue without regulation, calls attention to the Filer Commission's recommendation "that a permanent national commission on the nonprofit sector be established by Congress." A Filer II will have to confront the issue of regulation.

THE BEST OPPORTUNITIES FOR PHILANTHROPY

Having unburdened myself of issues concerning the internal workings of the sector and of its relationship to the other two sectors, let me now turn to a recitation of what I consider to be "the best opportunities for philanthropy" in the future. In so doing, I am emulating Andrew Carnegie who, in *The Gospel of Wealth,* named what he considered to be "the best opportunities for philanthropy" at that time.

The opportunities unevenly sketched out here are intended to be in some ways mutually dependent and interactive rather than mutually exclusive. They also require keeping the other two sectors in the mix; philanthropy doesn't work alone.

1. MAINTAINING THE SYSTEM

Like Carnegie, I support the democratic capitalist system and its struggle to achieve the following goals:

- ?? political stability and order, which permit freedom of expression, participation, and association
- ?? useful work for everyone to the greatest extent possible
- ?? provision for vulnerable members of society
- ?? protection of community, but also of diversity
- ?? provision of public education

?? a healthy philanthropic sector to supplement the other two sectors and to provide space for the exercise of the moral imagination

I am concerned about the quality of democracy and of capitalism and about the vision and commitment of those who are the stewards of those traditions -- in the United States as well as abroad. Organized philanthropy should, in my opinion, confront the threats to the open and the civil societies of the United States and the West, as well as accept its role in advancing democratic capitalism and philanthropy elsewhere in the world. The philanthropist George Soros models that kind of stewardship of the tradition in his work to establish "open societies" in Eastern Europe.

In exercising our stewardship of the tradition, we need to encourage impartial, balanced, rational, disinterested, objective, well-informed assessments and critiques of democracy, capitalism, and philanthropy -- and of their interactions and boundary changes. The third sector is the best place for such work; neither government nor the market command as much trust and respect. However, the third sector may lose its relatively higher level of credibility and trustworthiness if ideology and partisanship continue to use philanthropy as a cover for partisan and self-interested agendas.

2. THE NEWS

The second priority is, perhaps surprisingly, "the news." I do not mean here the general array of activities called the media or even the press; I mean the gathering, dissemination, and stewardship of the information and knowledge we must have if we are to be free. We have thousands of journals of opinion but we have more limited sources of news.

Who is responsible for the news?

Society seems to offer only two ways of providing essential information: the first is through agencies of government; the second is through the market. The Soviet Union and other such tyrannies convince me that governments are unreliable providers of news at best, and active sources of disinformation at worst.

The provision of news in the United States depends not on the government but on the market. There is a romantic notion that the economic market produces a competition for news that improves the gathering and dissemination of it. my impression is that the quality of news has deteriorated rapidly, all the more rapidly as the media have become more blatantly and unapologetically like an entertainment business rather than a public service.

For example, the news about the 0. J. Simpson trial, the Thomas-Hill hearings, even the Million Man March convince me that there is more money in exploiting racial tensions than in calming them.

Many people like to point out that civil societies are societies in which civility is a virtue. Open societies are societies in which civility is maintained in the face of democratic disagreement. One of the most common complaints about the media is that "the news" overstates disagreement and overreports violence; incivility receives far more attention than civility; catch-phrases, especially negative ones, replace thoughtful argument and cultivate cynicism. Those who worry about public morals should devote at least some of their attention to the failure of the news to offer a balanced picture of American society.

The Million Man March was, after all, a philanthropic event, a voluntary action for the public good; it was characteristic of an open society in its rhetoric and of a civil society in its behavior.

One of the problems that pro-capitalists like myself must worry about is the capitalist tendency toward concentration and away from competition. That appears to be what is happening in the media.

As I travel outside the United States I am persuaded that we have as good a system of newsgathering and reporting as many of the developed countries in the world -- and we're terrible. Reports in the American press about what is going on outside our borders are simplistic, biased, and misleading. We have a small handful of good journalists and a large number whose own education about the world is shamefully deficient.

Philanthropic efforts to improve the news -- MacNeil-Lehrer, National Public Radio, and the relatively few other occasional experiments, for example -- provide a higher and more reliable standard of news than anything available to us on the networks or even locally.

But philanthropic efforts to reform the media are no guarantee that the news will improve. The prevalence of ideology over ideas threatens all efforts to seek balance and reason. A philanthropic rejuvenation of the education of journalists (including editors and especially publishers) might bear fruit.

The encouraging work to advance a new "Public journalism,," led by the Kettering Foundation, may show the way.

The nonprofit Pacific News Service, led by MacArthur "genius award" winner Sandy Close, is the closest rival to the Wall Street Journal in covering news that the rest of the print media ignore. Philanthropists must find ways to support alternative sources of news as well as alternative sources of opinion.

All of us who use words to persuade others -- preachers, journalists, professors, advocates -- should have to wrestle seriously with the inescapable ethical ambiguity of our work. Everyone else should be taught ways to sift through our words to find for themselves whatever grains of truth might be there.

Perhaps a bridge between the priorities of an open society and the responsible dissemination of the news is the practice of advocacy. "Advocacy" is used as an epithet by some conservatives; it is used as a prayer bead by some liberals. Believe the rhetoric of neither, but remember that advocacy is essential to philanthropy, whatever position is advanced.

3. PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT

"Public health" may seem an odd priority for private philanthropy, partly by virtue of the unfortunate confusion between "public" and "government," and partly because the necessarily coercive quality of what public health entails seems beyond the reach of philanthropy.

Neither public health problems nor environmental issues respect political boundaries; both are public goods. Yet in recent years both public health and the environment have fallen to the government as if they were exclusively a first-sector responsibility, and many of the people who supported those movements seem to have turned to other things.

Two unfortunate consequences have resulted: the first is that government management of public health and the environment has been wasteful and inefficient beyond any acceptable level; the second result is that economic interests opposed to environmental constraints or to public health monitoring of products now have political allies. My reading of events persuades me that some people want to exploit public unhappiness with government performance as an opportunity to make a shambles of the important progress made in controlling both human disease and environmental pollution.

The mythistory I recount to myself when I try to think about such things sees broad-based, grassroots efforts to protect forests and rivers from destruction by narrowly selfish or ignorant economic interests. The strategy of the grassroots initiatives was to give force to their objectives by translating them into legal and

governmental action. Unfortunately the result was the creation of some programs as blind and ignorant as anything the market could offer.

There is a philanthropic principle that one should “give back to the community from which one has gained wealth in the first place. Some companies, certainly those rooted in their communities and in business for the long term, willingly adhere to environmental conservation and consumer protection. Many of the now-derided "bureaucrats" are among the most dedicated and competent professionals we have in government. Voluntary associations concerned with public health and the environment should continue to make other corporations and government bureaucrats miserable whenever they fail to serve the public good.

4. ETHNICITY

The scholar Donald Horowitz once wrote that ethnic conflict is the most serious destabilizing force in the world. His argument is that the world will not end with a bang (nuclear disaster) but with a whimper (the weeping of refugees). I agree with that assessment. The notions of open society and civil society mentioned earlier assume that it is possible for humans to live together harmoniously -- despite the evidence to the contrary.

The banal insight that civil conflict is a sign that the first sector has failed in its first responsibility occurred to me on a train from Belfast to Dublin a year ago. That caused me to ask whether the second sector had any responsibility for preventing or controlling civil conflict; I decided it didn't. The market is interested in private rather than public goods, and peace is a public good. That then led me to the humbling conclusion that the only place we can turn when civil conflict erupts is to philanthropy -- to "voluntary action for the public good," weak, fragmented, and confused as it may be.

Philanthropy can be more confident that it will be effective if its work begins before civil conflict erupts. "Education for Mutual Understanding" is the name of

an educational effort in Northern Ireland that seems to make sense in a country where "common schools" enroll only ten percent of the children. The other ninety percent are divided between two religiously-based school systems. In Northern Ireland, the site of such terrible violence and suffering over twenty-five years, children are expected to learn to live together by going to separate schools that seem to emphasize why they can't and perhaps shouldn't live together.

Philanthropy provides a web of affiliation based on voluntary choice rather than on ethnic identification; voluntary associations offer the promise of alternatives to violent conflict. There is nothing certain about that result, of course, but readers in search of certainty will have dropped out of this essay long ago.

Would it be presumptuous of me to suggest that the philanthropic responsibility for holding communities together is a primary responsibility of religious philanthropy? Presumptuous or not, I believe that religious philanthropy is failing in its duty. In some cases politics overrules the religious responsibility to be mediator and peacekeeper; in other cases it is ideology, and in too many other cases indifference or ignorance.

As the Irish religious leader and author Jonathan Swift put it almost three centuries ago: "We have just enough religion to make us hate, but not enough to make us love one another.

Of all the elements gathered under the rubric of ethnicity, religion is often the most powerful and usually the best organized. Perhaps organized religion should be thought of as the steward of ethnic harmony; if so, it is time for it to accept its responsibilities.

My recommendation is that ethnic organizations, including religious ones, take it upon themselves to help control and limit ethnic conflict. I would urge that, to be a member of an ethnic organization, it would be necessary to have a commitment to encourage and maintain ethnic harmony.

What I am groping for others could understand and express better than I can: some way to turn the strengths of ethnic cohesiveness to societal concord rather than division. If we can use sex to sell jeans, perhaps we can find ways to use passions like ethnic loyalty for higher purposes. (By the way, have you noticed how ethnically and racially integrated and inclusive advertising and marketing have become?)

Ethnic organizations are a very different kind of philanthropic resource than, say, rich people or business corporations. They are more democratic, broadly-based, diverse, and close to the grassroots; their membership represents a large potential pool of volunteers and small individual donors. They sometimes have some of the strong qualities of religious congregations, and are in fact often closely tied to them.

5. THE VULNERABLE

The core of all philanthropy is concern and care for those Robert Goodin calls "the vulnerable." People without land in an agricultural society provided the impetus for ancient charity; something like that is still needed. It makes little sense to tell small children to care for themselves, or orphans to get help from their families, or Alzheimer's victims to work for a living. Last week in Oaxaca, conversing with a young Mexican friend, I was approached a dozen times in an hour by small children and old women selling things. Five Chiclets, for example, or a shoe shine, or a toy. The distinction between asking for help by selling something and by begging vanishes. I can walk along any major street in Manhattan and have something like the same experience, although in New York I will be confronted by more adult men and women, more alcoholics and drug addicts, than I met in Mexico. My problem is that in neither place will I find much organized and systematic effort to change the lives of these people who seek my help. The forces of government seem more concerned to keep the vulnerable out of sight than to serve their needs.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees counts people in two categories of what is now increasingly called "forced" or "involuntary" migration. There are those living involuntarily outside the country in which they claim citizenship. These are called refugees and there are about 25,000,000 of them in the world at the moment. There are others who cannot stay in their homes but flee from violence or oppression to another part of their country. These people are called displaced persons and there are an estimated 17 million of them worldwide.

Someone recently commented that the size of the refugee and displaced person population is not proportionately greater than it was between World War I and World War II. If so, the "crisis" may be chronic and of longstanding.

I doubt that the UN Commissioner's count includes all the world's homeless. There is also the ongoing debate about whether and how to count people on the road for economic reasons -- the cast of The Grapes of Wrath.

We will argue to what extent government is responsible for providing shelter to our homeless. Who is responsible for refugees? What is the role of philanthropy in the refugee crisis that never seems to end?

Neither a civil society nor an open society can tolerate large numbers of people suffering from neglect or*oppression and remain "civil" or "open." The existence of such conditions calls for better and more careful news reporting of what is going on. It appears to be the case that some cultures care better for their members than others. My own white, Protestant, middleclass, geographically-mobile culture is among the most deficient in such matters, I'm embarrassed to say; we have let economic claims undermine other values.

6. CORPORATE PHILANTHROPY

The rationale for corporate philanthropy has shifted from the needs of the community to the interests of the corporation. The argument seems to be that CEOs are either too uninformed, too insensitive, or simply too clever to be taken in by the rationale that prevailed in the days of the Filer Commission.

In the 1950s it was the CEOs who made the case for corporate philanthropy; now CEOs have to be persuaded by their staff.

Staff members in turn discover that it is easier to make the case on the basis of corporate interest than it is to make the case on the basis of community need.

The following quotation from a recent Giving U.S.A. Special Report presumably expects to find a receptive audience:

"'My role as a marketer is to put our limited marketing dollars in the causes that will get us the biggest bang for our buck. As a marketer, what catches my attention is great press. What we're looking for is good exposure, good positioning and good contacts, and you're looking for the funding. There's nothing wrong with having a class nonprofit and a class corporation joining hands in a victory celebration. It's image enhancement for both of us, and it makes an everlasting impression on the corporation."' (I'm reminded that Jane Fonda made an "everlasting impression" on Dow Chemical.)

Corporate philanthropy is not about the superficiality of "image enhancement." It is about corporate service to the community beyond what is required. If it serves the corporation first, it should be treated as a business expense, not as a philanthropic contribution. It is the CEO' s responsibility to know the difference.

A good friend of mine, a longtime staff member in charge of a corporation's program of grantmaking and community relations, made it very clear: "A

generation ago," she said, "I would have been attached to the CEO's office and he [it would have been a 'he'] was personally and directly involved in the corporation's philanthropy. Since we've become more 'professional,' people in my role are vice presidents-specialists--and the philanthropic program depends on us. And we don't have the same clout as the CEO."

The CEO remains the key figure in corporate philanthropy. His absence or lack of interest -- his lack of involvement -- sends a clear signal that philanthropy isn't important. Real philanthropy, that is. The struggle to protect the mission of corporate philanthropy from becoming something else -- a public relations program, usually -- has always been difficult. Going out into the community has always entailed risks, risks that raise fears of angry shareholders, prying reporters -- criticism, even.

At the time of Filer I, most of that criticism came from the Left: corporate grants were often for the wrong purposes or organizations. Filer II will hear the same complaints but perhaps drowned out by the criticism from the Right: corporate grants are often for the wrong purposes or organizations. Both Left and Right compile "enemies lists" and judge corporate philanthropy according to an ideological test.

Unless corporations give up making grants altogether, such criticism will continue. CEOs will have to decide whether to march to someone else's drum or listen to their own.

For the most part, business schools have made matters worse. They have increasingly accepted a too-narrow and too-short-term view of corporate performance. But philanthropy, under the guise of "nonprofit management," may infiltrate the corporate culture once again. Young people trained in such programs may ask more and expect more of corporate leadership.

If so, John H. Filer -- the person and the CEO -- would approve. He came to call it "corporate social involvement" and he was right. That's what it takes. One reason why the American business corporation has stood apart from other countries' corporations has been its social involvement and its social responsibility. The future of that tradition now appears problematic.

7. EDUCATION

Andrew Carnegie learned about philanthropy from his parents, his religion, and the Scottish culture in which he grew up. He also learned from a specific act of philanthropy from which he benefited -- the invitation to use the 400-volume private library of Colonel James Anderson, which prompted him to make the construction of free public libraries his boldest and most extensive philanthropy. Colonel Anderson gave Andrew Carnegie the gift of self-education.
Self-education meant self-help, and all that a young boy like Andrew needed was the chance to learn. A truly philanthropic gift for the society that welcomed him, he thought, were public libraries where children could learn if they had the desire to do so.

The university that most decisively influenced my attitude toward education, the University of Chicago, was made possible, at least in part, by the gifts of John D. Rockefeller, Sr. Libraries and universities brought me into dialogue, if you will, with public teachers like William James, whose values as well as whose learning have given me insight into philanthropy.

There is a web of philanthropy and education that helps millions of people make sense of their lives- Philanthropy is a cluster of values and ways of being human within society; it is a "tradition" that is much more than a set of laws and theories. As such, it is imperative that it be preserved, strengthened, and passed on.

If the concept of the three-sector society is the Filer Commission's most important contribution, I believe that the emergence of philanthropy as a field of study, research, teaching, and training is Filer's second most important contribution.

Phase one in the development of philanthropic studies is now well advanced. There are hundreds of courses, many degrees, thousands of students, and perhaps a thousand faculty members working at more than forty academic centers and in a hundred or two less formal settings. Those of us who have been most involved in the effort to make the diffuse subject called philanthropy a "real" subject can feel some sense of accomplishment for the post-Filer (and post-PONPO, the most direct outcome of the Commission's work) progress toward this goal.

There are, however, some reasons for concern. From the very beginning, there has been reason to worry that philanthropy in the academy will become fatally academic. We now have journals, learned societies, even tenure-track positions. We have demonstrated that philanthropic studies can find a place in foundation philanthropy. Those advantages sometimes mark the onset of the bureaucratic sclerosis that haunts the academy as it haunts every other domain of organizational life. My request to a future Filer Commission is that it assess the consequences of launching this new field of study.

A second request is that it look beyond the place of philanthropic studies in higher education to the sequentially secondary, but substantively primary, need of philanthropy in the education of children at the level of secondary and especially elementary school. If philanthropy is good for children -- good for their self-esteem (as evidence seems to indicate) and, through that, good for their behavior and performance in other aspects of their lives -- then it should become part of their formal education. If that is the case, we have to retrace our steps to higher education again to ask about philanthropic studies in teacher education. A future Filer Commission might recommend that a consortium of teachers' colleges, in league with a consortium of academic centers of philanthropy, bring philanthropy formally and seriously into teacher education.

Teacher education in philanthropy has already cropped up in a most surprising place. Jasminka Ledic, a young Croatian woman, became involved in philanthropic studies while a Fulbright scholar at Indiana University. On her return to Croatia, she talked with the director of an international foundation office in Zagreb; she wanted to know if there were others who might be interested in her project to introduce a course for teachers on philanthropy. She was told somewhat rudely that, in a country torn apart by war, there was no time for teaching children about philanthropy.

Jasminka was seeking colleagues rather than money, however, and so she persisted. Now, as far as I know, hers is the first successful effort of its kind -- certainly the first I've heard about. The course on philanthropy she has designed is now a requirement for students who plan to major in education at the University of Rijeka.

The Commission might also ask for the development of teaching materials about philanthropy for classroom use, but also for use with ordinary citizens and volunteers, to help more people, prepare for roles as trustees and stewards. There are few areas of philanthropy where more progress has been made than in taking trusteeship seriously, so much progress in fact that much more should be done to carry that experience farther in the lifeworld of volunteers.

The education and training of those who would find their occupation (their calling?) in philanthropy is another extension of the Filer Commission's diffuse influence. The question now is, Is the third sector moving toward the kind of institutionalization that has shaped the traditional professions? Will career service in philanthropy become a "profession," and if so, how will it resemble and how will it differ from other professions?

A related question, of course, is whether the concept of professional is any longer meaningful or even necessary. My own answer would be that the status of

professional is meaningful only if it is identified with being trustworthy in commitment to service. Philanthropy's integrity requires trust. Will not-for-profit organizations seek the same level of credibility and trust once claimed by hospitals, say, or will they return to caveat emptor?

Finally, if it is true that the Filer Commission brought the subject and then the study of philanthropy into public consciousness, then a future Filer Commission should ask about the well-being of the field. There should perhaps be a "National Board of Visitors" for the field of philanthropic studies.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Public attention seems to focus on the importance of money in philanthropy. Because it is harder to measure, voluntary service is less visible. Neither voluntary giving nor voluntary service would have much effect were it not for voluntary association. Voluntary association gives effect to personal values of compassion and social values of community.

In the seminar in Gdansk, one of the Polish participants spoke of his personal experience as an ally of Solidarity and an opponent of the Communist regime. There was some personal risk involved, more serious, I gather, than the risk accepted by protesters in the United States in recent decades -- for civil rights, for example, or against abortion.

My Polish friend told the story in response to my question about the difference between the notion of philanthropy and the notion of "civil society." He said that civil society has meant "growing independence from the state" -- political freedom, freedom of choice.

As we discussed it later, we agreed that the protest movement in Poland was possible because of voluntary action. Solidarity and its extensions became a

movement of voluntary associations sustained by the voluntary service of individuals -- a movement strong enough to bring down a tyranny.

We agreed that no democracy of the future will be possible without a strong third sector, without philanthropy.

That is the ultimate challenge (opportunity?) facing any future Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.

Robert L. Payton
November 1995