



Sleepwalkers – an essay on confusion

By: H. Peter Karoff

*Draft 3/29/04
Not for Distribution*

The Philanthropic Initiative, Inc.
77 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
617.338.2590
617.338-2591 – fax
pkaroff@tpi.org
www.tpi.org

"To appraise a society, examine its ability to be self-correcting. When grievous wrongs are done or endemic suffering exposed, when justice is denied, watch the institutions of government and business and charity."

David K. Shipler in "The Working Poor"ⁱ

Prelude

I am confused, and the older I get the greater the confusion. While the confusion of which I speak is personal, it emanates from the troubles or what might be called disconnects, within the society in which I live, and it affects the decisions I must make. It also affects my work, which happens to be philanthropy. Like an actor who cannot remember his lines, it makes one's stomach churn. Confusion is not a good thing, especially if the confusion is over fundamental moral questions. At what point, for example, does something constitute a 'grievous' wrong, 'endemic suffering' or 'justice denied'? When, for example, does an issue like systemic poverty become 'material' to the moral health of the nation? If the numbers of the very poor were to increase by one million, ten million, twenty million, would that constitute more of a crisis of conscience than the one that we face today? None of this makes sense to me. It is part of my confusion.

Confusion is not what one expects from experience. Experience is supposed to teach how the world works and lead to greater clarity about how to live one's life. I thought that with age and experience more peace of mind would come, instead of less. I expected something different, a kind of resolution, a weaving together of the strands of living.

Maybe I am listening to the echo of my own rhetoric, or engaging in wishful thinking that there should be less cacophony, and more harmony. The truth is I am less optimistic, less confident and less sure about what to believe. Even when I think the 'answer' to a question is clear, I do not know what action to take that will be meaningful, what, if anything, will make a difference. Sometimes I am not even always sure what is right and what is wrong, but what confuses me the most is why in the face of what seems to me to be overwhelming evidence, so many people, including those who are our leaders, continue to act as though nothing is wrong.

Do they? You may ask. Perhaps things are not as bad as I *feel* they are. I hope so because this sense of helplessness induces a kind of alienation, angst, and inexorably a fear.ⁱⁱ I don't like these feelings of anxiety at all - they seem self-indulgent, but I know I am not alone in this kind of complaint about the human condition. It is hardly new. If in doubt, look at the literature for those caught in equilibrium, those who are sleepwalking.

The Sleepwalker

In the novel *The Sleepwalkers*,ⁱⁱⁱ the monumental trilogy written by the German writer Hermann Broch in the late 1920s and early 1930s, the protagonist of the first volume suffers from an existential malaise. He is disconnected from reality and unable to cope with the society in which he lives and dreams, and about which he feels a great sense of futility. He is a mirror image of the narrator in Marcel Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past*,^{iv} which was written in the same era about another society that had lost its way, lost its soul. Proust's narrator is not so much somnambulant but sleep-talks rather than

sleepwalks his way through the novel in what becomes a hyper-conscious, voyeuristic musing on the world around him.^v And what in his predicament reminds me of my own is that action eludes him. In the same way, or so it seems, that action eludes our society as a whole.

Two more recent novels that reflect the troubles of our own times also come to mind. Don DiLillo's novel, *Underworld*, tells the story of America from the time of the Dodger/Giants game in 1951 when Bobby Thompson's legendary homerun became a symbol of an era ended, it was called the "shot heard round the world". The novel's protagonist, a different kind of sleepwalker, drifts aimlessly through fear and denial of the threat of nuclear war while the society around him seems oblivious, and is obsessed with growing corporate materialism. And Jay Cantor's remarkable novel, *Great Neck*, takes us deep into the turbulent '60s when radical and self-destructive action took on a violent life of its own. For those caught up in that time of passion and idealism amidst powerful forces of race and class, the sleepwalker woke up and for some, the dream became a nightmare.

Whenever we read books, such as these, with the substance, symbol and beauty of great narrative, we understand better what it takes to face our own personal demons. We understand more vividly the dilemma of a society that has diminished capacity to be 'self-correcting'. But life is not literature and none of us are characters in a book. Instead, most of us would agree with the poet Jane Cooper when she wrote - "I am trying to learn to live a decent life and not want to be a great person, and at the same time know what I

have the human right to draw the line at.”^{vi} That is in essence what most of us want. But what does living a decent life mean for you, or for me, when a society has lost its soul, when the community in which we live has lost its way, what does it mean, what do you do? Knowing what is right, and having the right to 'draw the line' is one thing, exercising it is another.

Action is hard in a society where trust is in short supply and cynicism is pervasive, where too many people are overwhelmed by cultural norms that are offensive to them. Action is hard if one feels powerless in the face of extremism, which is a kind of false faith. The result is what one contemporary writer describes as a "decreasing sense of relationship to the whole".^{vii} It is what many writers have written about from very different perspectives.^{viii} When that relationship is lost across an entire society, especially a democratic society dependent on citizen engagement, we give up a lot. We give up too much. Too many citizens are not participating, are not actors on the stage of life.

Scott Harsbarger, the former President of Common Cause, and a two-term Massachusetts Attorney General, cites the central role of citizen mobilization in making democracy really work. Harsbarger believes it is all about the need to reeducate people about what it means to engage in democracy, what it means to be citizens. If too many citizens are sleepwalkers, which I believe is the case in the United States in the year 2004, that task is made hugely more complicated.

What I resist believing with all of my being, is that we as a society do not care, or do not care enough.

On Caritas - the American Social Contract

Caritas, caring for others, community, generosity, charity and its American invention, philanthropy, has been at the center of the social contract that binds this society together. A social contract can be founded on a belief in God, on justice, on values, or even prejudice and preference. It cannot rest on tax policy and tax exemptions, even though one might get the idea that those are the central elements.^{ix} At its heart, a social contract is about reciprocity, about sharing -- sharing power and about sharing wealth.

The American 'deal' between society and its citizens, has been a blend of opportunity, personal responsibility and benevolence within a context of democratic and free market principles. Those principles are inextricably linked. Concepts like fairness, equality, access, level playing field, community, and communities of interest - terminology that speaks to a kind of public stewardship - have been balanced with the energy and individualism of the entrepreneur and the competitive reality of the market economy. It has never been a simple, even-handed, balance. And in many instances, it has been a hard difficult struggle, but in the US that combination has produced remarkable results from the perspective of both a quality of life and equity for the vast majority of Americans. Most remarkable has been the interrelationship and mutual dependency of government and citizen action -- what we now call "civil society." The world has never seen this level of democratization before. Yet something may be eroding the civil society. It is the

concentration of power of both ideas and capital, and the decline in both benevolence and equal opportunity. What I do not see is a self-correcting response that kicks in, even when we have crossed the line. What I see is less sharing.

While there are a number of indicators of this phenomenon, it is the growing gap between the very wealthy and the very poor that is the most striking evidence of the collapse of the American social contract.

Rich and Poor

In 2001, the top 1 percent of the US population held 38 percent of all wealth, double that of 20 years ago -a concentration of wealth that is remarkable and troubling. For example, in 1989, the top 1 percent of the population held less wealth than the bottom 90 percent of the population. By 2001, the top 1 percent held \$2 trillion more wealth than the bottom 90 percent.

The US is the wealthiest country in the history of the world, and yet, some 38 million people, 12.4 percent of the population, a percentage that has increased every year in the last ten, live below the poverty line,^x with an additional six million classified as the 'working poor'. For this working poor the American Dream is an illusion.

Families living in poverty grew from 6.6 million in 2001 to 7 million in 2002 and the number of children living in poverty is now 12.2 million.^{xi} This population has less

mobility than ever, only a third of the poorest families have some kind of housing subsidy or financial assistance, and housing costs are at an all time high.^{xii}

Hunger is an everyday issue for more than 13 million children in America!^{xiii} (Can this actually be true? The answer is yes.) Overall, there are more than 30 million inadequately fed Americans.^{xiv}

This is not new data to me and it may not be to you. I have known about these statistics for a long time, and poor people are hardly invisible. The data is before our eyes, on the street corner, on paper, and in the Congressional Record but somehow as a society we sleepwalk by it all. When I hear an economist who is not troubled by this data because it is immaterial to the economic health of the nation, I wonder what I am missing. It is part of my confusion.

The philosopher John Rawls^{xv} argued that economic inequality is not the issue as long as "it is to everyone's advantage" and it results "in compensating benefits for everyone and in particular for the least advantaged members of society." It becomes untenable when compensating benefits do not exist, when the imbalance goes too far, and when the 'response' is not equal to the situation.

If the imbalance between the rich and the poor in the United States is troubling, it is more dramatically so elsewhere in the world. The disparity between the rich nations of the North, especially the United States, and the poor nations of the South is extraordinary.

While much has been made of the destabilizing effect of desperately poor populations and how those conditions become breeding grounds for civil unrest and terrorism, it is the broader moral issue of massive human suffering that haunts my own dreams. And it awakens my own personal Greek Chorus.

I will consume less, and become part of a movement, urge my neighbors and friends to sharply reduce our absurdly high American standard of living. (Chorus)

Be my guest, that's a guilt trip for God's sake. Your individual action won't effect anything. Plus, if you and others were really successful, the US would nosedive into a huge recession and take the rest of the world with us.

I will change my foundation's giving priorities and no longer support my local theatre or arts organization in favor of poverty alleviation, even though I love the arts. (Chorus) Great, you are going to turn your back on the one thing that you believe brings perspective, not to mention beauty, into the life of this arid society.

I will join the chorus of voices that argue for more responsible codes of conduct for multi-national corporations and a reassessment of the forces of globalization. (Chorus) Good luck! These guys have got it wired between the power and the greed of the market economy. They are not going to be influenced by do-gooders like you.

I will advocate for the things that I believe in, make the politicians listen, and organize my community to lobby for a broader public interest. (Chorus) Who do you think you are - Saul Alinsky? All you will do is get your name in the paper and on more lists.

I will work my butt off to get rid of this President- he is the problem. (Chorus) It would be political suicide for any elected official really to take up the cause of the poor. Bottom line- too many people don't give a damn.

I do not know how to answer these questions. (Chorus) That's right, and neither does anyone else.

Is that true? Are there really are no answers? I think the answer is yes and no.

It is not a matter of financial capacity. If the US can find \$200 billion to fight a war in Iraq because it was deemed necessary to do so it is hard to understand why it can not find the resources needed to combat poverty. In fact, the cost to deal with much of the inequity is remarkably modest, well within the capacity of this nation and the wealthy nations of the world collectively. For example, it would take \$5 billion a year to end hunger in America - today largely spent in updating the food stamp program.^{xvi} Five billion is not a large amount in a \$10 trillion economy. Looked at differently, it is a fraction of what we spend annually on cigarettes, beer, or cosmetics.

It is not a matter knowing what to do. There are solutions and there are strategies that work. There is much that can be done to enable people to lift themselves out of poverty.^{xvii}

Then Why?

Perhaps the focus on the poor is the wrong one to test the thesis that our society has a "decreasing sense of relationship to the whole". For example, the US middle class is caught on the dark side of globalization, outsourcing, and increased productivity. For many currently well paid Americans there are a decreasing number of post-industrial and information age jobs. These jobs are moving offshore as multinational corporations follow in a heart beat the inevitable flow of economics. For the first time in US history, economic growth is not directly linked to the creation of new jobs. This new dynamic is a tough economic and social problem that has the potential to lead, at least in the short term, to a serious decline in the economic well being of the American middle-class. It certainly contributes to the resistance by most Americans to even the idea of raising taxes, and it certainly has its own moral dimension of something unfair, even if it does not sink to the same level of fundamental inequity as does the plight of the very poor.^{xviii}

If we as a society can sleepwalk past the most vulnerable among us, it is highly unlikely we will respond to anything else. And that includes the other major ultimatums^{xix} of our time on this earth - weapons of mass destruction, and environmental degradation. Or the world's immense health and disease issues, paramount among them the AIDS pandemic.

Suffice it to say that we all see everyday the growing evidence concerning these planet-threatening problems.

Is it a surprise I am confused? The confusion is in the air. We stare each evening, courtesy of the TV news, into the face of an interconnected social malaise. The message overwhelms, numbs, desensitizes, and neuters our sense of what is possible. It dilutes our innate sense of justice. It feeds and contributes to the loss of trust. Asking whether we as a society care may be the wrong question. Whether we are able to feel is perhaps a better question.

In the process we are educating a whole generation of our children to be complacent, to see such things as the norm, as acceptable. And they are not.

Is there a root cause, something that can explain, or at least shed light on, why we do not respond? Perhaps there is.

A House Divided^{xx}

American society is deeply divided along several fault lines. To begin with, we are politically divided right down the middle. Many of America's divisions are ideological, some are economic, and some are based on class and race. Patrick Buchanan, at the 1992 Republican convention, termed the problem a 'cultural war'^{xxi} and a 'religious war' in conflict for the soul of the country. The polls in response to President Bush's proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit gay marriage are illustrative. Forty-six percent of

Americans would vote for such an amendment and 45 percent would vote against it.^{xxii}

The economic divide is sometimes referred to as the "Two Americas",^{xxiii} one with the highest standard of living in the world, and another without even basic health insurance (fully twenty percent of the population under age 65).

There are big and complicated lines of disagreement, where the argument has become increasingly strident, and even vicious. Mistrust is high at all levels. Say the word "liberal", or "evangelical", or "environmental", say any number of words, and the knee-jerk reaction is almost visceral. The American polyarchy, its inherent pluralism, has worked historically, but it is increasingly lopsided, and it is difficult to see how it can continue to work.^{xxiv}

And herein lies the greater risk. If we destroy, or have destroyed, the deeply democratic American capacity for civility, for consensus, for generosity of spirit that has been integral to the success of the society, we will grow more polarized, less able to deal with critical issues, and more lacking in political will. In fact, it may be completely wrong to say that Americans do not care because in some instances it may be that they care too much. We have gotten entangled in a kind of social war that begins with a loud argument about how to approach problems and then makes the *approach* the issue, drowning out and missing, the substance of the problem. It is then, as Jane Jacobs, the noted Canadian urban sociologist has argued, that the gaps become "unbridgeable".

Certainly the ideological divide is not in every instance so clearly defined. Many Americans are concerned to see a society increasingly committed to the pursuit of pleasure and explicit sexuality, a society dependent on an all-consuming consumer-driven materialism, a country determined to become a bully economically and diplomatically and growing increasingly isolated in the process. A society where priorities have become warped, values diluted, fundamental morality on some very basic levels lost, a beat-the-law mentality that ranges from corporate fraud and greed to pervasive underage drinking on college campuses, where the law has become a joke. There certainly is no ideological divide on the problem of the "working poor," for it is one of America's cherished assumptions that anyone who works full time should be able to make enough money to live on.^{xxv}

Are these Republican or Democratic issues, liberal or conservative issues? I think they are everyone's. Are they troublesome to those who are religious and go to church or temple, as well as to those who are not churchgoers? I think they deeply trouble both. It is not delusionary to make the case that there are many spaces within the sometimes-contentious public debate over major policy and social issues where we agree far more than the rhetoric suggests. Perhaps that is why most Americans are in the ambivalent middle, and why most analysts conclude the country is not ready for a pitched battle on these issues, and if anything has become more progressive and accepting.^{xxvi} And it is the middle that is most afflicted with alienation, most unengaged. It is the middle that sleepwalks.

At the same time, huge differences of opinion and belief exist on matters that relate to the role and size of government, its involvement in citizen's lives, and governmental regulation - especially in regard to the environment, and energy consumption. The struggle over values and the relationship of church to state is real. And globally, the relentless march of globalization, beyond raising domestic concerns about outsourcing, pits the unbridled expansion of the market economy and increased development against the wishes of indigenous populations and major environmental concerns. These issues cannot be sugarcoated, nor solved through rhetoric or a mechanical process of conflict resolution. There is no easy consensus. One of my colleagues who is chair of the school board in a small town in Vermont put it well: "The problem with making democracy work is the citizens- there are too many of them." So true! My point is related. It has to do with the societal imperative, which is part of the concept of stewardship, to reach a middle ground and the central capacity to do so.

The Commons

Jane Cooper is right, we are entitled to "know what I have the human right to draw the line at." But are there other lines we are not entitled to draw, or to say, "It ends here!" The truth is what is outrageous to one person is acceptable to another. What is a sin to one person is not to another. What is in my interest may not be in your interest. What are my beans are not your beans. We need to respect others as much as we respect ourselves. When I demean the beliefs and perspectives of others, and attack their lifestyles and perspectives, I have crossed the line of commonweal. When my passionate advocacy goes 'over the top,' when my private individual action 'privatizes' the public space, I have

abused the privilege of individual action. I have violated another's human right. I do not want the 'public space' - the 'commons' - to limit the diversity at the table. When it does I cannot win, we cannot win, and there is too much anger and fear generated, too much mistrust. The truth is one cannot 'win' without yielding. It is in the nature of all things, of any successful relationship between parties. True in our personal relationships (witness the critical ingredients of accommodation and compromise in marriage) and just as true in every other relationship. One cannot make a successful deal -- business, political, community, local, national, or global -- unless it fundamentally works for all sides.

Perhaps we need to adapt John Rawls' dictum around economic inequality and make an operating premise that might go like this: *We are each entitled to advocate for our personal opinion so long as it is to everyone's advantage to do so and so long as it results in compensating benefits for everyone, in particular for the least advantaged in society, or those who are most at risk.*

Or read again Walt Whitman's lines from the poem *Song of Myself*.

*I celebrate myself, and sing my self.
And what I assume you shall assume
For every atom belonging to me as good belongs to you.*

Except for those few who believe entirely in their right to unbridled individualism, in essence to be pathologically selfish, I think this works. And for those, there are other answers.

Does the suggestion that advocacy can be carried to an extreme diminish the need to stand up for what one believes, or the need for communities of interest to argue their case? Or does it mute the differentiation between right and wrong, or good and evil?

In my view, it does just the opposite. It makes the practical imperative for strong countervailing voices even more important, especially in the face of extremism. It makes the case for an informed citizenry that takes an active part in the democratic process more essential. Rather than undermine the case, it bolsters the case for a robust multi-voiced and pluralistic advocacy. It is "a plurality of voices, a plurality of visions", that is the balance to extremism.^{xxvii} In the rising up of more voices is the answer to the question of which lines can be crossed and which lines should not be crossed. It ultimately leads to the heart of how democracy works, the answer to what makes people accountable, and to whom.^{xxviii}

Response

Since I work in the field of philanthropy, these personal 'confusions' affect me professionally. While government has by far the greatest responsibility to the social contract -- as well as infinitely greater capacity to respond to major social problems -- citizenship and voluntary individual action in a democratic society have the ultimate influence on government action. Philanthropy is an important articulation of citizen voice; is uniquely positioned to encourage more inclusion, as well as to give form and clarity to the issues that engender this confusion. Philanthropy at its best is also nimble and creative.

My colleagues and I see the impact of these questions on foundations and donors of all stripes every day.

The wealthy family confronting a decision on the allocation of wealth between family members and charitable gifts is influencing on a personal level, the issue of rich and poor, and the redistribution of wealth. There will be millions of such decisions made by individuals and families in the years to come. The vast volume of the intergenerational transfer of wealth makes those decisions a material factor in the well being of society. The donor moved by inequity - perhaps it is poverty, perhaps it is something else - who decides to act makes one statement. The donor who decides to play it safe and limit gifts to elite institutions that primarily cater to the wealthy makes another. The donor who believes that government is not fulfilling its responsibility and takes a strong and public position makes one statement. The donor who says nothing makes another.

I admire the pluralism of American philanthropy, part charity, part preservation, part social venture, part system change, part social marketing, and part advocacy. I respect the importance of religion to so many Americans and understand why so much charitable giving goes to support religion.^{xxix} I acknowledge the loyalty alumni have to their universities and colleges and know how well funded institutional fund raising efforts pay off. I have also learned that many mega-gifts to elite institutions are by default. These institutions are among the few games in town that can handle such gifts. I know that recognition, social pressure and influence, and ego, are huge factors in why people give money to charity. I know social relationships and business obligations are real and

influence giving. I know it is complicated to figure out how to tackle tough social problems, that it takes a lot of work to invest philanthropic resources thoughtfully, and that many donors do not know how to go about that work. I also know that many people simply do not have the time or interest to work hard at making a difference, and that a few do not care at all.

Despite all that, it is confusing to me that more wealthy individuals and families have not heard the wake-up call, do not see themselves as stewards of wealth, or do not have an instinctive sense of give-back. I do not understand why responsibility to the broader society, to the community where one lives and works, to the world itself, is not more pervasive. Why more of those with wealth have not carved out the time, the focus, and the discipline needed to be thoughtful and brave. I just do not get it. I do not understand the absence of stewardship, especially when one looks at the stunning role models that exist on every level.

I know, without knowing the specifics, there are thousands of stories of *Donor-Leaders*. My confusion is why there are not tens of thousands. My confusion is why such behavior is not normative. My confusion is why so much wealth remains in the woodwork and not in philanthropic play, why there are so many with so many advantages who sleepwalk through their lives and who like Proust's narrator, fail to act.

We & Me

Part of the problem is in the way we go about the business of philanthropy. For example, why do we put such a big emphasis on tax exemption as it relates to philanthropy and charitable organizations? Americans, Congress, regulators, and worst of all, organized philanthropy is confused about this one. For a field that understands how to make a case statement, I think we are making a very poor one.

If taxes were eliminated would that eliminate the social compact connecting philanthropy with social good? Does moral obligation decline as tax rates decline, along with the value of the exemption reduced? Arguing for philanthropy from the perspective of tax benefits puts charitable giving in the box of a tax scam for the rich. It weakens and makes diffuse the basic moral rationale for philanthropy, which is that we act out of concern for the human condition. Overselling the tax benefits exacerbates the crisis in trust that impacts philanthropy and charitable organizations. Tax deductibility is simply an enhancement. Yet we trumpet and market that enhancement as though it were the real deal. Tax incentives have become inextricably tied to making gifts by the pitches of fundraisers and tax advisors who talk the tax talk. We have educated a generation of donors to think a certain way and in the process have become captive to a self-fulfilling prophecy. The common assumption is that tax deductibility is a huge swing factor in the level of charitable giving. Shame on us if that is really true.

I use the philanthropic 'we' all the time. But I am not sure if 'we' means organized philanthropy, organizations like the Independent Sector, the Council on Foundations and

regional associations of grantmakers, or unorganized philanthropy -- individual donors and recipient organizations. I fear that 'we' is the false modesty of an editorial 'I'.

If so, then the actor called 'we' is at heart a distributor of largesse, and is at risk of being patronizing, and elitist. Part of the challenge lies in the philanthropic process.

Paul Brest, President of the Hewlett Foundation, said that his greatest confusion in running a major foundation is how to operate from a 'strategic perspective' -- something he has carefully thought through and is deeply committed to -- and still remain open to hunches, to new ideas, and to being opportunistic.^{xxx} He is right.

From the perspective of true caritas, I think philanthropy as it is practiced needs a lot of work. And as you can see, I/'we' also need to clean up my/our nomenclature. It is very important who the 'we' is.

Coda

This essay has come to a point that cries out for some kind of resolution, recommendation, ideas, anything that might begin to unlock and resolve the logjam of confusion. But all I can offer is the hope that clarion calls can sometimes move people to action. All I can suggest is that leaders and leadership are in demand.

And I do know what I want:

A society that has enough common sense to understand (and bravery to admit) that good will and building bridges is neither naïve nor dangerous.

A we that represents a broad and open public purpose and supports a citizen-driven process that inhabits the public commons and that has the humility to fund the structures of an open society.^{xxxix}

Philanthropy dedicated to the promotion of citizenship and civic values, and to the education of society, especially the young.^{xxxix}

Philanthropy that invests in social entrepreneurs and nurtures and incubates civic leadership.^{xxxix}

A philanthropic sector willing to roll up its sleeves and seriously address the critical issues in America and around the world -- especially poverty, but others as well. How about an adaptation of 'tithing' where foundations and individuals commit at least 10 percent of their giving to issues that are truly in the public interest. In view of the \$220 billion of annual giving in the US, that decision alone could generate more than an additional \$10 billion a year in resources.^{xxxix}

I see all of these things as possible. Do you? But the sleepwalker needs to awaken in order to make it happen - perhaps that is my job; perhaps it is yours as well. Perhaps then, some of my confusion will be resolved.

Admonition

*Tell me stories of kinship
Of tropes of caritas effortless
Across a world stage
Tell me what you want to hear*

*In the face of fury
Moderation is a great fiction
A rhetorical stance subject to guile
Too much is at stake*

*What good are voices of good will
Sleepwalkers haunt my dreams
The cascade of moments has begun
This macrocosm this heart will break*

*Sometimes you are the only actor
Alone in the audience of your soul
Or your God if you admit to one
You cannot you dare not abdicate*

H. Peter Karoff is the founder and chairman of The Philanthropic Initiative, Inc.

5,658 words

ⁱ Source *The Working Poor*, by David K. Shipler, Alfred A. Knopf publishing.

ⁱⁱ For a further discussion on the relationship between helplessness, confusion and fear see the manuscript *Ecology of Being* copyright © 2004 Peter A. White

ⁱⁱⁱ *Sleepwalkers* by Hermann Broch was published in three volumes between 1931 & 1932

^{iv} *Recherché (Remembrance of things Past)* by Marcel Proust was published between 1913 & 1932 with the last three volumes appearing after his death

^v Source Dr. Rebecca Karoff, whose doctoral dissertation was based on the work of Broch and Proust

^{vi} from Jane Copper's essay *Nothing has been used in the manufacture of this poetry that could have been used in the manufacture of bread* from the book *Scaffolding*, Anvill Press Poetry Ltd, 1984

^{vii} see *Ecology of Being*

^{viii} see the work of Robert Putnam and Richard Florida

^{ix} From Phil Cubeta's comments on the *Essay on the Issue of Trust*. Cubeta blogs under the name Wealth Bondage

-
- ^x The 2003 Federal poverty threshold for a family of four (2 adults and 2 children) was \$18,660. Source US Census Bureau.
- ^{xi} Source the Census Bureau's American Community Survey 2002
- ^{xii} Source National Low Income Coalition
- ^{xiii} Source Household Food Summit in the US 2002
- ^{xiv} Source Bread for World Institute in Silver Spring, Maryland
- ^{xv} John Rawls, the noted Harvard philosopher, published his landmark book, *Theory of Justice*, in 1971
- ^{xvi} Source is the highly respected Bread for the World Institute in Silver Spring, Maryland. Other relevant data from USAID and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization estimates the cost of reducing the number of hungry people in the world by half, from 800 million to 400 million, is in the range of \$5 billion a year more than is currently being spent
- ^{xvii} see the 20 year record of accomplishment of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and the Enterprise Foundation in community development or the work of the Paul & Phyllis Fireman Foundation program to end homelessness for families in Massachusetts over a five year period
- ^{xviii} See Bob Herbert's Op Ed *Dark Side of Free Trade*, New York Times, Friday, February 20, 2004
- ^{xix} See *Before the Storm*, Peter C. Goldmark Jr. in the book *Just Money, a critique of contemporary American philanthropy*, TPI Editions Spring 2004
- ^{xx} *A House Divided* is the title of Mark Gerzon's book that describes an American society deeply divided from seven sociological perspectives
- ^{xxi} James Carroll writing in the Boston Globe, March 9, 2004, traces the phrase "culture war" from "Kulturekampf", a term coined in the 1870s by the German politician Otto von Bismarck
- ^{xxii} Peter Jennings on the NBC Evening News February 24, 2004
- ^{xxiii} Both John Kerry and John Edwards used these words during the CNN Democratic Primary debate in Los Angeles on February 26, 2004
- ^{xxiv} Joel Fleishman used this term in his essay *Simply Doing Good or Doing Well* in the book *Just Money, a critique on contemporary American philanthropy*
- ^{xxv} source *The Working Poor*, by David K. Shieler
- ^{xxvi} see *The Culture Wars, Part 11* by Robin Toner, New York Times, Sunday, February 29, 2004
- ^{xxvii} Peter Frumkin in the transcript of *Trouble in Foundationland*, a conference of the Hudson Institute Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civic Renewal
- ^{xxviii} Scott Harsbarger made these points in his response to the *Essay on Trust*
- ^{xxix} 35% or \$84 billion of the \$220 billion Americans gave to charity in 2002 went to religion
- ^{xxx} from a conversation with Paul Brest, February 2004
- ^{xxxi} from Phil Cubeta
- ^{xxxii} The work of the Tufts University College of Citizenship and Public Service, funded by a major grant for the Omidyar Foundation is one exciting example
- ^{xxxiii} The organization *Ashoka*, founded 24 years ago by Bill Drayton, has supported more than 2700 *Ashoka Fellows* who are hard at work in making the linkages between economic development, social action and civic engagement
- ^{xxxiv} Of the \$220 billion in charitable giving in 2002, the allocation is as follows- 35% to religion, 13.1% to education, 2.6% unallocated, 7.7% to health, 5.1% to Arts, culture & humanities, 4.8% public society benefit, 2.7% to environment, & 1.9% to international affairs. While hard to estimate how much of this is invested in various aspects dealing with systemic poverty issues, the figure is in the range of 8%.